

The Classical Review

JUNE 1890.

PERSIUS MSS.

Cod. Bodl. Auct. F. i. 15 (formerly no. 2455)
Jahn's β ; *Cod. Trin. Coll. Cantab. O. 4.*
10 (referred to below as ω).

By the kindness of the authorities of Trinity College, Cambridge, I have now been able to put these two MSS. side by side and compare them.

Mr. Madan and Mr. Macray have been good enough to look at them carefully with a view to fixing their date and nationality more certainly. They think

(1) That in the Cambridge MS. the original text is late tenth century, the small hand used in glosses, which Prof. Conington thought to be by the same hand as the text, dates from about 1000 A.D. or soon after, and the larger marginal scholia perhaps from late eleventh century.

(2) That the text of the Oxford MS. dates from a little after A.D. 1000, and its scholia (and most of the *vv. ll.* which I had thought to be by the same hand as the text) from say 1050.

(3) That both MSS. were entirely written

in England, but that the Oxford one is in the text much more under foreign influence than the Cambridge one.

As to the connexion between the two MSS. it is closer than I thought. I was very wrong in accepting Prof. Conington's edition as an adequate authority for the readings of ω . It fails to notice a great number,¹ and is sometimes positively wrong.

Those, then, who have this edition, and wish to have a full account of ω 's readings, should note the following addenda and errata. (I have not noticed all the mere trivial misspellings of ω , such as *Prol. 2. sompniasse* for *somniasse*. These are plentiful. Where I have noticed trivialities my reason is that Conington has noticed similar trivialities in other passages, and therefore invited the inference that when he is silent these slight differences do not exist.)

¹ *E.g.* in the two passages, I. 57, III. 78, where I noted in my February article an important difference between ω and β , there is none, but Conington had failed to note ω 's reading.

ADDENDA.

- Con.'s text.
- I. 7. quaesiveris
32. hyacinthia laena
34. Hypsipylas
57. extet
106. unguis
II. 41. Poscis
III. 73. nec
78. sapio sapis est
84. nihilo nihilum
NO. XXXIV. VOL. IV.

ω .

quessieris
iacinthina lenna
his pipylas
extat
unges
Poscit
neque
satis est sapia^o
nihilum nihil

	Con.'s text.	ω.
IV.	29. veterem	ueteris
	33. ac	at (fortasse ac prius)
V.	7. Helicone	ilicone
	17. dicis	dicas
	71. cantum	canthum
	98. hac [error typograph., credo]	hoc
	128. nec quicquam extrinsecus	nequicquam extrinsecus
	136. ex	et
	140. oenophorum	inophorum
	142. Luxuria	luxoria
	145. quod	quam
	146. tu	tun
	149. nummos [error typograph., credo]	nummi
	155. huncine	hunc cine
	183. thynni	tinni
VI.	14. vicini	Vicino
	15. ditescant	Ditescant (ex -unt)
	17. lagoena	laeogenia
	24. tenuis sollers	tenues solleris
	28. inops	inobs
	37. incolumis	incolomis
	urget	urget
	48. dis	Diis
	79 deciens	decies

ERRATA.

	ω ap. Con.	ω.
I.	44. fas est in margin.	uel fas est in margin.
	91. compossitas	compossitas
IV.	7. callidae	callide
	8. (tur in ras.)	(tur linea erasum)
V.	111. fexum e fixum ut vid.	fexum
	120. litaberis	litaberis (is alia manu additum)
	123. satira	satiri
	156. dominus	dominus in -os conversum
VI.	56. Cliviumque uirbii	Cluiumque ad uirbii

I now proceed to give an account, which I believe to be complete, of the differences between β and ω.

With regard to trivialities. they differ :—

- (1) Varying between *e* and *ae*, 38 times.
- (2) Varying between single and double consonant, e.g. *s* and *ss*, *t* and *tt*, 35 times.
- (3) Varying between *es* and *is*, 3 times.
- (4) Varying as to presence of *h*, 8 times.
- (5) Varying between *g* and *gu*, 5 times.
- (6) Varying between *i* and *y*, 5 times.

(7) Varying as to presence of assimilation, e.g. *ff* (*df*, 5 times).

Considering how erratic both MSS. are on these points, so small a list of differences argues very strongly, it seems to me, for a close connexion. On no one of the points is the difference consistently or nearly consistently in the same direction. ω seems a little fonder of *e*(*ae* than β.

I add a collation which will show to those acquainted with ω's readings the exact readings of β in all points except the seven mentioned above.

	ω	β
ProL.	6. semipaganus	[In marg.] uel semipaganus
	14. Pegaseum	semipagus
		Pegaseum
I.	6. ^a ue	uel ue
	7. quessieris	que
	34. his pipylas	quesiueris
		ypiphyllas

ω.		β.	
I.	36. At ^e sensere poeta	Adsensere poetae	
	41. indulgeas	indulges	
	44. vel fas est (in marg.)	aliquid (glossa, credo,) quod legere nequeo,	
	adūso (so in ras.)	supra 'feci' scriptum et erasum	
	50. nabe't	aduerso	
	56. qui	habet	
	58. pinsit	uel quid	
		qui	
	59. imitata est	pinxit	\$
	63. sermo	uel ri	
		imitata est	
	69. docemus	sermo est	\$
	^u	[uerbum superscript. et erasum]	
	71. ros saturam	uidemus	\$
	72. fumosa	rus saturum	
		fumosa	
	74. quem	uel cum	
	dictatorem	quem	
	77. uerrucosa	dictaturam	\$
	85. qui	uerrucosa ex uerrucosa	
	90. uer [s. eras.] um	quid	+
	95. Si	uerum	
		Si ^c	
	105. lab ^r [s. eras.] is	labris	
	106. rapit	sapit	
	107. uero uel su	uero [litura 3 litt. sequitur]	
	112. inquit	inquis	
	114. mejete (sic)	meite	
	120. ipse	ipsi	M
	125. et	ad [in lit. ?]	
	131. insecto	secto [post lituram 2 fortasse litt.]	
II.	6. prumptum	promptum ex prumptum	
	10. ebullit	ebullat ex ebullit	
	patris	patrus ex patris	
	13. expungas	expunga	M
	14. conditor	conditur	
	17. [qi. eras.] est	est	
	18. est	est ^{ne}	
	19. taio.	staio	\$
	22. taio	staio ex taio	\$
	26. ergannaque	ergennaque	\$
	35. manibus ['in' eras. et in ras.	manibus quatit	
	'quatit']		
	37. Nunc	Hunc	
	40. rogabit	rogabit ,rit	
	41. Poscit	Poscis [s. credo, in ras.]	
	45. arcessis	accersis [ex accessis, credo]	
	59. aere ^a	aera	
	70. uirgine	, uirgine	
	73. animo	animi ex animo	
III.	3. Stertimus (r. in lit.)	Sertimus	
	17. pappere	pappare [a in ras.]	
	21. maligne	maligne	
	37. ingeniom ^u	ingenium	
	43. quid	quod [o in ras.]	

	<i>ω.</i>		<i>β.</i>	
III.	52. ^u deprehendere	deprendere		
	63. ⁿ tūnebit	tūnebit		
	68. ^o datur qua fluxus	datus ex datur quam flexus	‡	
	77. ^o centuriānum	centurionum		
	78. ^o sapia	sapio		
	80. ^o lumine	lumine ^a		
	81. ^d rapiosa	rabiosa ex rapiosa		
	84. ^d nihilum	nichilum		
	104. ^d crassis	crassisque	‡	
	109. ^d pecunia	pe [t eras.] cunia		
	114. ^d haud	haut		
	116. ^d iram	ira [rasura sequente]		
IV.	2. Di cere	Dicere		
	8. loquere ex loqueretur	loquere		
	16. Anticiras [ex -rus]	anteciras		
	merecas	meracas	§	
	25. ^u nectidi	[ras.] uectidi [ras.]		
	26. ^u oberrat	oberret [re in ras.]		
	28. ^a compta	competa		
	35. ^a hi penemque	in ex hi penem		
	36. ^a buluas	uuluas		
	46. ^a cume [e in rasura, quae longius extenditur]	cum me		
	59. ^a nequicquam	nequiquam		
V.	2. optare	obtare		
	4. ^a educentis	ducentis	§	
	5. ^a rubusti	robusti		
	7. ^a ilicone	elicone	‡	
	8. ^a prognas [prior pars n in ras. Prius s uel f]	prognas		
	11. ^a primis	premis	‡	
	13. ^a stōloppo	stloppo		
	15. ^a teris	terēs	§	
	17. ^a dicas	al. dicis	§	
	18. ^a plebeaque	doceas		
	23. ^a tibi	plebeiaque		
	26. ^a his	tibi		
	33. ^a umbro	hīs		
	36. ^a seposui	umbo	‡	
	44. ^a uerecundia	subposui	§	
	45. ^a dubites	uerecunda	‡	
	51. ^a quid	dubitas ['a' in ras.]		
	57. ^a hi indulgent dequoquit	quid		
	66. ^a fiat	hic indulget decoquit	§	
	quid	fiet ['e' in ras.]		
	70. ^a se	quid		
	73. ^a quique	te	‡	
	74. ^a Puplius	quique		
	100. ^a ell [ras.] rum	Publius		
	111. ^a fexum	elleborum		
		fixum	‡	

ω.	β.
V. 114. liberque ac	liberque ac ^{al. atque}
116. polita	uel tua polita
118. relego	al. repeto relego
120. litaberis ['is' alia manu additum]	litabis
121. uncia	untia
127. negator	nugator ^{o c}
128. nequicquam	nequiquam
xst	xt
136. et	et [t notatum ut eraderetur]
140. inophorum	enophorum
145. quod	quod
extinxerat	extinxerat
147. Vejentanumque	uegentanumque
150. sudore	sudare ex sudore
153. meror	memor
156. dominos ex dominus	dominos
159. abrupti	i. abrupti arripit [in ras.]
162. cherestratos	cherestratos
163. arrodens haec	abrodens hoc ['o' in ras.]
167. diis	dijs
168. censen Daue	censem da [ras. 2 litt.] ue
172. nec	ne [tum ras. unius lit.]
174. exieris	exieras [ex exieris, credo]
nunc n̄c	ne—c nunc
quod	in ras.
177. uigilia	quem
179. actum	uigila
180. [ras. 1 lit.] uenire	at cum ex actum
183. tinni	uenere
188. alli	thymi [prius, credo, 'thȳni']
189. 'haec' omis.	allii
VI. 4. strepitum	strepitum
10. Enni	ennii
11. quintes et	Quintus ex [in ras. 'x' fortasse al. man.]
13. agulus	uel an
14. Vicino	aggulus
15. Ditescant [ex 'unt']	Vicini
17. laeogenia	Ditescant
23. scombro	lagoena
24. solleris	al. rombos
26. Emule	scombro
32. inopi	sollers
37. incolonis et	Emole
44. cladem	inopis ex inopi
pubis	al. sed
46. clamidens	incolumis et
49. in luco	cladem ex cladem
50. Si	pubis ex pupis
51. inquis	clamides
56. Cluiumque	al. duco
58. haud promte	in luco
	uel nisi
	t ni [in ras.]
	uel s
	inquit ['t' in ras.]
	Cluiumque
	haut prompte

	ω .	β .
VI. 59. unum	est etiam	Vum est [ras. 2 litt.] iam
63. uins		uin
66. tatus		staius [in ras.]
75. Vnde		Vende
77. plausisse		al. pavisse
79. depunge		plausisse
		depinge §

Everywhere else β 's reading = ω 's.

An analysis of these variations shows that in 32 places only β 's reading shows no trace of ω 's reading and no erasure which may have destroyed ω 's reading. In 2 of these, marked Σ , β seems simply to have made a slip. In 14 more, marked \ddagger , it is possible (in most of them probable) that the scribe of β , who I think knew what he was writing about, used his sense to correct ω 's mistakes. But there remain 16, marked \S , of such a

nature as to make it certain that β 's scribe had a sight of a MS. other than ω .

On the other hand, apart from the general feeling of connexion produced by finding the total amount of variation so very small, there are 28 passages, which I proceed to note, where β 's scribe appears to have seen a reading untraceable [as far as Jahn's information goes] except in ω . In some of these the point is one of spelling, in others it is more important. I have put the more important last.

	$\omega\beta$		Cet.
I. 129. sopinus		supinus	
II. 6. prumptum		promptum	x
II. 45. fortunare		fortunare	
V. 142. luxoria		luxuria	
III. 69. obtare		optare	
III. 80. opstipo		obstipo	
V. 98. puplica		publica	
VI. 28. inobs		inops	
IV. 28. competa		compita	
IV. 35. dispuat		despuat	
V. 167. diis		dis	x
VI. 48. diis		dis	
VI. 56. virbii		virbi	
V. 188. capud		caput	
VI. 73. patritiae		patriciae	
III. 75. munimenta		monumenta	
II. 22. taio		staio	x
II. 57. mittent		mittunt	
III. 17. pappere		pappare	?
III. 43. quid		quod	?
IV. 11. discernis		discernis	x
IV. 23. descendere		descendere	x
V. 73. quique		quisque	x
I. 131. et insecto		et secto in	?
V. 179. actum		at cum	x
VI. 11. et		ex	?
VI. 59. est etiam		est iam	?
VI. 13. ω agulus β aggulus		angulus	

8 other passages where $\omega + \beta$ are almost unique in their reading are I think worth adding.

	$\omega\beta + 1$ MS.		Cet.
VI. 21. patenae		patinae	
II. 10. patris		patruus	x
III. 81. rapiosa		rabiosa	x
V. 145. extinxerat		extinxerit	x
VI. 26. metuas		metuis	

VI. 49. in luco $\omega\beta + 1$ MS.

III. 116. iram

III. 68. datur $\omega\beta + 2$ MSS.

In the passages marked \times , β no longer has ω 's reading, but it can be distinctly seen that it had it once and has been corrected away from it. In the passages marked $?$, an erasure in β just at the point where ω 's erratic reading occurs makes me believe β had that reading originally.

It is perhaps worth adding that in VI. 50 ω 's scribe (who does not know Latin and divides words erratically, e.g. VI. 22 ut arego for utar ego, V. 189 varicosos oscenturiones for varicosos centuriones) writes arto creasque instead of artocreasque, and here β agrees with him, the writer of β 's scholia afterwards noting 'vnum verbum est' above.

I would submit, (though with some diffidence, owing to want of experience in dealing with MSS.) that the whole evidence is sufficient to prove that β 's scribe did copy his MS. in the main either from ω or from an extraordinarily exact copy of ω ¹; but that he had another MS. at hand, which he now and then consulted when dissatisfied with the reading of his main authority. Hence, as we have seen, here and there β 's readings have an independent value of their own.

With regard to the scholia (which I have looked at a good deal, but not gone through with any completeness), there are some curious signs of connexion, as it would seem, between the two MSS. ω has hardly any scholia after the end of *Sat.* I. and much fewer than β has even on *Sat.* I. Yet it looks as if the writer of β 's scholia had sometimes looked at ω 's scholia when he was writing. I am speaking at present of ω 's smaller and earlier hand.

The passage which really seems convincing is I. 114, 5. Jahn, in his edition of the scholia, reads on l. 114 *secuit Lucilius urbem*, the following scholium 'Quid ergo? Quod aliis licuit, mihi non licebit?' and a great deal more. On *genuinum* in the following line, he reads 'Genuinus proprie dens, qui sub genis est.'

In ω the text and scholia appear thus:

Secuit lucilius urbem licuit cebit
quam nris aliis licuit inu
dens ē q. sub genis ē q. una cum homine nascitur

¹ Or perhaps ω and β may be (so to speak) brothers; I was inclined to think this impossible, for where ω has been corrected β has almost invariably used the correction. But Mr. W. M. Lindsay suggests to me that this may be so explained: a reviser corrected ω where the scribe had departed from the archetype; β was itself copied from that archetype, and so does not reproduce ω 's errors. If so ω is a very exact but unintelligent, β an intelligent copy of the same MS.

Cet.

induco
ira

datus

Te lupe, te mucī et genuinum fregit in illis.

β has

dens ē q. sub genis ē q. una cum hne nascit quamuis aliis licuit m
 n licuit cebit

Te lupe te mucī et genuinum fregit in illis

Both then have corrupted the first scholium in *exactly* the same way. And it seems an almost irresistible inference that β 's mistake in regarding the two scholia as one is due to the relative positions they hold on ω 's page.

Much less important, but confirmatory, is I. 120, where for 'O libelle, uidi homines stultos' ω reads uide, evidently a mistake, and β has uide corrected into uidi.

On I. 121, where Jahn reads 'si mihi Iliada Labeonis, aut Neronis Troicon tradas,' ω β both omit 'Troicon,' but here the omission does not destroy the sense.

There is one passage in which, but for the testimony of the experts on the comparative age of the hands, I should have said β 's scholium was a misinterpretation of one of ω 's larger-hand scholia. On I. 11 *tunc, tunc, ignoscite, nolo*, Jahn reads 'ἐκλειψις, sc. dicere.'

ω reads 'Tunc tunc defectio. Τοεξικ. dicere,' which appears to mean 'tunc tunc'; then comes an ellipse: what should follow ('viz.: τὸ ἐξῆς) is dicere.'

β reads Τοεξικ. i. defectio: which appears to turn sense into nonsense. In this case I suppose the two writers have copied from a common archetype.¹

People interested in the scholia on Persius may like to know that on I. 12 ω 's large hand reads 'cachinnus est cum voce risus immoderatus quod ΜΟΡΑ-ΓΕΛΩΝΤΑC dicunt,' thus confirming the reading which Jahn in 1843 quotes as attributed on authority that he does not trust (vid. pp. clxii. clxiii.) to the codex Bon. Vulcanii, but which Bücheler has merely adopted in the 1886 edition, and which certainly makes sense whereas Jahn's *μονογέρον-τας* is nonsense.

It seems noteworthy palaeographically that in two places I. 114 *mejete*, V. 147 *Vejentanum*, ω shapes an i very like a small modern printed j. In each place the i is between two vowels; in each it gets in some MSS. corrupted into g.

¹ It is possible that this Τοεξικ was originally a corruption of ἐκλειψις or ἑλλειψις.

G. R. SCOTT.

ON 2 COR. vi. 14—vii. 1.

I cannot think that Mr. Chase, in his remarks upon this passage (p. 150), has succeeded in making 'clear and natural' the connexion of thought at the beginning and end of the paragraph.

St Paul has been accused by his enemies of scheming and planning, and palming off upon his followers a patchwork creed more false than true; of adulterating, playing tricks with, truth; of arrogance and interested motives; touching his own qualifications, of falsehood and imposture. His answer to his friends is to lay bare his heart; to tear off every scrap of disguise, reserve or modesty or reluctance; to shew them his most secret and sacred motives, the inmost workings of his soul. How all the defamation wounds him, he does not hide. He could not do justice to the sovereign power of that motive which sustains him, if he understated the sufferings through which he is sustained. He is writing of his accusers, to his friends—friends among whom his enemies have been busy, dispersing slanders and alienating loyal hearts. Some have listened and been persuaded; others have listened and doubted. But others (and the tenor of the Epistle warrants us in saying that these were the great majority of the Corinthian Christians) had warmly and enthusiastically renewed their attachment and devotion to St. Paul. It must of course be noticed that the tone of the letter varies; that just now he thanked God for the news which Titus brought—'God, who always and everywhere makes us triumphant'; that now he hints half-confidence and coldness; that presently again he uses the strongest language he can find to describe the heart-searchings, the penitence, the affectionate enthusiasm, excited by his former letter. We cannot exactly answer for all the lights and shades which come and go upon this agitated sea of feeling: here it may be that the darkness is the shadow of a cloud, but there perhaps the wave of emotion makes a shadow of its own. Whilst in one place St. Paul may be thinking of actual differences amongst those who received his letter and acknowledged his authority (for all men are not equally capable of affection and penitence), in another his demand for fuller confidence and more complete openness is perhaps only the inevitable result of the extraordinary passionateness and intensity of his own feeling, which exacts the same passionateness and intensity from them. It

might well be that, with the most abundant cause for gratitude, he yet should feel his own soul swept by such a flood of emotion, that their confidence and affection, however great, were scarcely yet a full response to his. Nothing will satisfy him short of love for love, such passionate and unreserved outpouring of the heart as that which he bestows on them, the perfect fruit of perfect friendship, which ripens only in hearts as generous and upon lips as eloquent as his.

'My lips are opened, my heart is enlarged.' Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh: the eloquent lips are the expression of the generous heart. 'Ye are not narrowed in me: ye are narrowed in your own affections.' If there is reserve between us still, any want of trust and openness, of the freedom of perfect love which pours out its whole heart unrestrained, the narrowness is yours not mine. 'Enlarge your hearts as I; open wide the liberal embrace of your affection; till I am required, even with love for love.'

I must continue to think it inconceivable that at this point St. Paul turned aside to say:—But do not also throw open the liberal embrace of your toleration to the sons of Belial, the worshippers of idols: do not contaminate yourselves with the vices of the unclean Corinthian society in which you live.

And that he then resumed, precisely where he left off, 'Make room in your hearts for me.'

It is not accurate to say that, when he continues 'I wronged no man, corrupted no man (by laxity of teaching), defrauded no man,' his tone has altered: that 'a shadow has passed over his enthusiasm.' The charge of encouraging Antinomian laxity, we are told, 'seems to be lurking in the background of some passages.' Surely it was never absent from his thoughts: and, so far from the question (ii. 17) *kai pròs taúta tís íkavós*; (a question asked not in doubt, but in astonishment at the greatness of the work to which he by the power of God has not only been called, but made sufficient) being 'buried' beneath other thoughts, everything from that point to this has been an answer to it. He is mightier than his opponents, because *their* motives are corrupt and *his* are pure. He preaches the pure and unadulterated truth of God; *they* have corrupted it.

The denunciation of Antinomian excesses

would not only be out of place here: there is no place for it in the Epistle. The person who had contracted the scandalous marriage has been expelled from the church. The Judaizing party are in rebellion, on other grounds. But the 'Antinomian' section of St. Paul's followers have made full and absolute submission. The crucial test of their submission was their treatment of the wrong-doer. They have expelled him, and expressed the deepest and fullest contrition for his fault, as in part their own. On this point St. Paul is not only satisfied, but abundantly and warmly grateful: *ἐν παντὶ συνεστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀγνοῦς εἶναι τῷ πράγματι. χαίρω, ὅτι ἐν παντὶ θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν.*

So much for the 'problem.' It may be that my solution of it is too bold; but this is better than ignoring it. It will be noticed that the suggestion of an error possibly much more ancient than our oldest MSS. is not altogether met by a reminder of 'the probability that copies of the Pauline letters were multiplied from the very first.' Of such letters as 'Romans' and 'Ephesians,' naturally: letters equally interesting, one of them to all European, the other to all Asiatic,

Gentile churches; and one of them possibly, the other certainly, addressed by St. Paul to more churches than one. But why also of this second letter to Corinth, so intimate, so personal, from the first line to the last?

I suppose the intermingling with 2 Cor. of this passage from the lost letter, if such it be, to have been accidental. Mr. Chase's quotation from Deut. xi. 16 suggests, however, another possibility. Some one, with a keen eye for verbal resemblances, reminded by St. Paul's *πλατύνθητε* of the *πλατύνθη* of the Deuteronomist, and seeing some connexion between the heart's *πλατυσμός* enjoined by the former and the immoral *πλατυσμός* condemned by the latter, may have thought it edifying to insert the one passage (presumably also of St. Paul's writing) as an antidote to the other. Mr. Chase thinks that, if the passage in question were what I have supposed, it would contain the exact phrase *μὴ συναμιγνύσθε πόρνοις*. This objection would have been of more force if the question had been of a whole letter, supposed to be the lost letter, and not of a fragment.

R. WHITELAW.

STAHL'S REVISION OF POPPO'S THUCYDIDES, BOOK II.

Thucydidis de bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo explanavit ERNESTUS FRIDERICUS POPPO. Editio tertia quam auxit et emendavit JOANNES MATTHIAS STAHL. Vol. I. Sect. II. [Book II.] Leipzig: Teubner. 1889. pp. 260. 3 Mk.

This volume completes Stahl's revision of Poppo's Thucydides. As in the previous volumes, the original notes are for the most part retained, though the present editor has so revised the work as to make himself responsible for the whole, and to put upon it the imprint of his own scholarship. So in the first chapter, Stahl takes *ἐν ᾧ* in a temporal sense with *ἐνθένδε*, and thinks that the passage shows that Thucydides was acquainted with the whole course of the war. The text differs (besides corrections of orthography) in many cases from that of Poppo, the changes consisting for the most part in the exclusion of words which seem to have crept into the text from marginal notes. Examples of such exclusion are 4, 2 τοῦ μὴ ἐκφείγειν, 4, 4 λαθόντες καὶ, 4, 5 πλησίον, 29, 2 ὁ τοῦ Σιτάλκων πατήρ, 29, 3 ὁ Τηρεὺς, 89, 3 ἐκάτεροί τε, 96, 1 ἐς τὸν Εὐξείνιον τε πόντον καὶ

τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον, and many others might be added. Other changes are made, sometimes for grammatical reasons, e.g. 3, 2 κρατήσεν for κρατήσαι, 83, 3 διαβάλλοντες for διαβαλλόντων, sometimes because the sense or the connexion seems to demand it, e.g. 65, 12 δέκα μὲν ἔτη for τρία μὲν ἔτη, 2, 1 τέσσαρας μῆνας for δύο μῆνας (see below), 40, 1 τὴν πόλιν ἀξίαν < νομίζω > εἶναι where νομίζω is inserted by Stahl, 44, 1 ἐντελεντήσαι < ἢ εὐδαιμονία > ξυνεμετρήθη where ἡ εὐδαιμονία is newly inserted. These changes, a complete list of which would occupy too much space, are all in the direction of a more consistent and comprehensible text, and they certainly render the text more readable. It is, however, by no means certain that Thucydides invariably expressed himself in the way most easily understood by modern readers, nor that he was always perfectly consistent in his mode of expression. So the change in 83, 3 mentioned above removes a grammatical solecism, but such a solecism is more likely to have been committed by Thucydides than by any copyist who transcribed the work at a time when the rules of grammar were much more carefully observed than

when Thucydides arose as the pioneer in the realm of Attic narrative prose. The chief (or I may say the only) fault of this excellent edition is this attempt to make Thucydides regular in his use of language, and even in this Stahl displays moderation.

The texts and notes are followed by three appendices. Of these II. (ad 52, 3 et 84, 1) and III. (ad 102, 3, 4) are retained from Poppo's edition of 1866; appendix I. treats *de temporum ratione Thucydidea*, and is divided into two sections: (1) *de annorum in aestates et hiemes distributione*, and (2) *de belli Peloponnesiaci initio*. In section 1 Stahl adopts the now generally received opinion, that *summer* in Thucydides includes spring, and begins at the vernal equinox. This opinion is supported by discussion of the passages in which the beginning of spring is mentioned. It is, however, in conflict with the statement, II. 75, 3, that the Peloponnesians were engaged for seventy days in building the mound at the siege of Plataeae. For the expedition against Plataeae was made ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ σίτου (II. 79, 1), i.e. about eighty days (though it may well be less) after the beginning of spring. Before active operations were begun negotiations were carried on (II. 71, 72) and messengers went to Athens (73) and returned (74). Then the Peloponnesians cut down trees and built a palisade about the city, after which they worked (says our text) seventy days at their mound and tried to take the city with the aid of machines (75, 76). They then tried to set fire to the town. When all other means had failed, they set about building a wall of circumvallation (after having dismissed the greater part of their army, as our texts read, but Stahl rejects this clause), making brick from ditches which they dug, one on each side of their wall (78, 1). This wall surrounded the entire town, was double, and had high towers, besides dwellings for the garrison (III. 21), so that it must have taken much longer to build than the first mound. This wall was finished about the middle of September (περὶ ἀρκτούρου ἐπιτολάς, II. 78, 2). Now if the expedition was undertaken in June, ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ σίτου, and seventy days were occupied in building the mound, besides the time necessary for the previous negotiations etc., very little time remains for the building of the wall. Stahl therefore thinks

the building of the mound occupied not seventy days, but nine (θ' for ο'), which comparison with similar works elsewhere mentioned shows to be sufficient. Whatever we may think about the particular emendation suggested, Stahl's arguments against the common reading are sound. Stahl further shows that by the expression (V. 20, 1) καὶ ἡμερῶν δαλίων παρενεγκουσῶν days to be subtracted from, not added to, the ten years' period are meant. Thucydides includes autumn in the summer (II. 31, 1; III. 18, 3; 100, 2; VII. 79, 3; VIII. 108, 2), and autumn was reckoned as the period from the morning rising of Arcturus to the morning setting of the Pleiades, i.e. from about the middle of September to the tenth of November. The winter then lasted from about the tenth of November until the beginning of spring. This is confirmed by plentiful reference, and seems indubitably correct.

The attack upon Plataeae, which Thucydides regards as the beginning of the war, was made at the beginning of spring (II. 2, 1), a few days before the full of the moon (II. 4, 2), which was in that year on the night of April 6-7. Then the reading in II. 2, 1 Πυθοδώρου ἐπὶ δύο μῆνας ἀρχοντος Ἀθηναίων cannot be correct if the Athenian archons began their year of office in the month of Hecatombaeon, for Hecatombaeon began in 431 B.C. on August 1st, i.e. four months after the beginning of April. Hence Stahl reads after Krüger τέσσαρας μῆνας. It also follows from V. 20, 1 that the beginning of the war was four, not two, months before the beginning of Hecatombaeon. In II. 2, 1 Stahl reads (after Lipsius) μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ποτιδαίᾳ μάχην μὴν ἕκτω < καὶ δεκάτῳ >, for the attack upon Plataeae was not six, but sixteen months after the battle at Potidaea. This appears from *Inscr. Att.* I. 179, for the battle at Sybota was about the middle of Metageitnion B.C. 433, and that at Potidaea soon after, i.e. early in the winter of 433-432. Stahl's discussion touches also upon several other points. This appendix is a valuable contribution to the literature of Thucydidean chronology, and adds not a little to the value of a book which would be excellent without it. Stahl's Thucydides is indispensable to students of that author, all of whom will rejoice that the work is now completed.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

BAYFIELD'S *ION*.

The Ion of Euripides. Edited by M. A. BAYFIELD. Macmillan. 1889. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a valuable and scholarly edition, with plenty of help for learners, and no lack of instruction and suggestion for more advanced scholars. The text has been carefully considered, and the editor defers unduly neither to faulty MSS. nor to bold correctors. He introduces a few corrections of his own. In 286 *τιμᾶ τί μάλει*; (for *τιμᾶ τιμᾶ* ὡς of MSS.) is ingenious, though hardly to be preferred to Hermann's *τιμᾶ τί τιμᾶ*; *οὐδὲν* for *οὐδας* in 434 is included in the list of novelties (p. xxiv.) by an oversight. In 1603 *ἦδη* for *εἷη* (or *εἷης*) of MSS. is less probable than Mr. Macnaghten's *εἰδῆς* (*Classical Review* ii. p. 42), to which Mr. Bayfield objects that the *τε* and *καὶ* preclude contrast. But why not 'that both he may rejoice in his fancy and you in your knowledge'? The treatment of grammatical questions in the notes is always interesting and instructive: but on one or two points the conclusions arrived at are hard to accept. *E.g.* in a detached note 'on the subj. without *ἂν* in relative sentences,' Mr. Bayfield contends that 'it is incorrect to regard such a sentence as *ὅστις ἐσθλὸς ἦ* as an abbreviated form of *ὅστις ἂν ἐσθλὸς ἦ*.' He considers that *ὅστις* without *ἂν* followed by subj. is not indefinite = *quicumque*, but generic (denoting one of a class), like *qui* with the subj. in Latin. But in Latin the primary indefinite mood, of a generalised statement, to include all cases, is *indicative*; in Greek it is *subjunctive*: whereas the generic mood in Latin is *subjunctive*; in Greek, *indicative*. Mr. Bayfield seems to have been misled by an arbitrary limitation of *ἂν* to the temporal meaning 'at any time.' He says, 'observe that in all these cases' (of *ὅς* without *ἂν* followed by subj.) 'the insertion of *ἂν* with its meaning at any time would be utterly destructive to the sense.' It is as if he contended that *quicumque* (or 'whoever') could not be used where the meaning 'who at any time' was inappropriate. Indeed this would be more plausible, for there is no reason to think that the original meaning of *ἂν* (like that of *cumque* and *ever*) was temporal. 230. 'ἔχω μαθοῦσα...' This intrans. use of *ἔχω* (= *εἶμι*) is very common. *ἔχω* is probably here (independently of *μαθοῦσα*) 'I understand,' and in the common periphrastic *ἔχω μαθοῦσα* (= *μεμάθηκα* not *ἔμαθον*) is not *ἔχω*, like Eng.

auxiliary *have*, transitive (*ἔχω ποιήσας τοῦτο* = *ἔχω τοῦτο ποιηθέν*)! 354. Those who agree with the grammars will not allow that 'this line is a clear disproof of the constant assertion of the grammars that sentences couched in this form imply a belief on the part of the speaker that the condition is unfulfilled.' It is true that Creusa has come to ask whether the child still lives or not. But the dialogue from v. 347 has proceeded on the assumption that he is dead. 'How long is it,' Ion had asked, 'since he was destroyed?' On the point whether *εἶεν* would stand for *εἴχ' ἂν*, the reader is referred to v. 839n., where by an oversight *ἦν* is commented upon as if there were no *ἂν*. The note would perhaps have been more appropriate on *χοῖν* 842, or 827, *ἀλοὺς ἀνέφερε* = *ἐμελλεν ἀνοίσειν*, where however *ἀλοὺς* = *εἰ ἀλοίη* (not *ἔλω*). Examples of apparent omission of *ἂν* are of two kinds: (1) prospective, as in the instances quoted from Lysias 7 § 32 (*ταῦτα πράξας ἐκέρδαινον οὐδέν*, 'I had nothing to gain by doing this'), Plato *Symp.* 190 C. (with implied protasis *εἰ ἀποκτείναναι*), Dem. *Onet. A.* p. 870 (*τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον πράξας* 'by acting in this way'); (2) where apodosis is suppressed, and an unconditioned statement is substituted for it, as Thuc. 3. 74 *ἡ πόλις ἐκινδύνευσεν διαφθαρῆναι* (was in danger of being burnt, and would have been burnt) *εἰ ἄνεμος ἐπεγένετο*, Lysias 7 § 37 *εἰ μὴ ὤμολόγουν, οὐδεμῶς ζημίαν ὀνοχος ἦν* (were liable to no penalty, and would have suffered none)—the construction so common in Latin and Greek with expressions of duty and possibility (*potuit contemnere, si dixisset*: might have despised, and would). Sentences with *ἐμελλον* will obviously be sometimes of one kind, sometimes of the other. It seems right to retain *εἴχ' ἂν* here, in spite of the unusual elision. 799. *οἶον* causal, usually explained as = *ὅτι τοιοῦτον*. Mr. Bayfield makes it elliptical: 'when I think what pain.' Is it not a shortness of expression arising from the omission of antecedent clause = *τοιοῦτον ἄλγος παθοῦσα οἶον ἔπαθον*? *Oed. R.* 1228 *νύμει στέγην, ἔσσι κεύθει κακά* (*scil. τὰ πάντα κέθουσιν*). 1307. The order of words is made more intelligible, if we think of *ὅπον σοὶ ἐστί* as a 'divided epithet' of *μητέρα*. 1316. If Mr. Bayfield had remembered the distinction (spoken of above) between *ὅστις* 'whoever' and *ὅστις* 'one who,' the one followed by subj. and optat., the other by indic., he would not have written the long and not very clear note on *ὅστις*

ἡδικοῖτο—indic. because generic, and imperfect, being the 'unfulfilled' past tense of present time, as ἐχρῆν is. (So, in a conditional sentence: e.g. *Rep.* ix. 592 D. εἰ μὲν πλοῦτω τε

καὶ κέρδει ἄριστα ἐκρίνετο τὰ κρινόμενα ἃ ἐπῆνει ὁ φιλοκέρδης καὶ ἔψεγεν, ἀνάγκη ἂν ᾖ ταῦτα ἀληθέστατα εἶναι.)

R. WHITELAW.

THE NEW EDITION OF ORELLI'S HORACE.

Q *Horatius Flaccus* ex recensione I. G. ORELLI: editio iv. maior: post I. G. BAITERUM cur. W. MEWES: vol. ii. Fasc. i. (*Sat.* lib. i. et ii. 1). 1889. 3 Mk.

THE fashion of reproducing under the light of recent criticism famous classical editions, which the progress of research is threatening to supersede, has many examples in our day, and the arguments for or against it will be felt to apply with peculiar force in the case of a work so long and justly popular as Orelli's *Horace*. Few, however, will doubt that, on the critical side at least, Orelli, if he were still alive, would find much to alter in his views:

Si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in aevum, detereret sibi multa,

and those who are jealous for the fame of the great Swiss scholar may congratulate themselves that the redaction of his edition has been entrusted to the hands of a critic so well equipped as Prof. Mewes and so generally in harmony with the spirit of Orelli's work.

The salient feature of the new issue is, we take it, the editor's conservative attitude towards MSS. authority and in particular the primary importance he ascribes to the readings of the Blandinian MSS. as reported by Cruquius. 'No one, I believe,' wrote Munro in 1869, 'now doubts the essential good faith of Cruquius': but just when these words were written Keller and Holder, whose edition of the *Satires* had not then appeared, were formulating a direct indictment against the integrity of the old Bruges editor. Prof. Mewes depends of course for the recension of his text upon the great critical apparatus of Keller and Holder; but, while utilizing the materials of these critics, he is far from adopting their views. He takes as his basis a selection of some ten of what he considers the best of Keller and Holder's MSS., and, as his brief prefatory note informs us, 'lectionibus ex his codicibus allatis maxima cura eas adiunximus, quas Cruquius ex quattuor Blandiniis, imprimis ex vetustissimo eorum (V) enotavit.' And Cruquius is especially valuable for the *Satires*,

because the best existing MSS. (all A and the greater part of B, C, R, D, δ) are defective in this part of *Horace*. Prof. Mewes has elsewhere given the ground for the faith that is in him. He has examined the whole question of the Blandinian MSS. in two monographs: one, 'de codicis Horatiani, qui Blandinius vetustissimus (V) vocatur, natura atque indole' (Berol. 1881), which identifies the 'unus' or 'quartus' of Cruquius with V, and a second, 'Über den Wert des Codex Blandinius vetustissimus für die Kritik des Horaz' (Berlin 1882), which contains an elaborate and very interesting defence of Cruquius against his modern detractors. The prejudice and perversity—as we must consider it—of Keller's attitude on this question is well illustrated by his note on *Ep.* i. 16, 43, where the true reading 'res sponsore' (MSS. *responsore*) is preserved by Cruquius alone: 'sic habet Blandinius vetustissimus et verissima lectio est, hactenus ignorata doctis.' This reading Keller, in common with all modern editors, accepts, but with how bad a grace! 'denn es konnte sehr leicht sein dass Cruquius...als der Codex selbst verbrannt und keine Controle mehr möglich war, sich oder uns übrige getäuscht hat....und ich muss erklären, dass ich hier an eine Konjectur des Cruquius nicht an eine wirkliche Lesart des verbrannten codex glaube.' But the good Cruicke—to give him the name he bore in the flesh—has elsewhere given us specimens enough of his conjectural skill, e. gr. *Ep.* i. 19, 12, where he proposes '*Exiguaque toga simul et textoque Catonem*': metaphoricos a lanariis mercatoribus, qui inspecto texti margine de universo facile coniecturam faciunt: and with such instances before us, we may well agree with Prof. Mewes 'dans une Konjectur (i.e. 'res sponsore') von so seltener Vortrefflichkeit....vom Kritischen Talente des Cr. eben-sowenig zu erwarten ist, wie Feigen von den Dornen oder Trauben von den Disteln.'

Acting on these principles the editor has introduced, on the authority of 'V,' the following changes in Orelli's text (Baiter 1868): i. 1, 8 addixit 101 Naevius 108 qui nemo, ut i. 2, 110 tolli i. 3, 60 versemur i. 4,

25 elige 110 Baius i. 5, 1 accepit 35 vatillum i. 6, 31 et cupiat 39 deicere de 68 nec i. 7, 9 tumidus adeo i. 9, 50 inquam 64 prensare i. 10, 27 patris Latini, ii. 1, 15 describit. Yet that Prof. M. can upon occasion stop his ear even to the voice of Cruquius appears from i. 4, 85, where he keeps the MSS. *avet* in spite of the *amet* of 'unus codex Bland.' This is the more surprising because Prof. M., as we have remarked, identifies the 'codex unus' with 'V,' and *amet* = *soleat* is not only a favourite Horatian word, but seems here demanded alike by the grammar and the sense. We notice too that in i. 1, 64 the codices Bland. have 'quatinus,' and the best MSS. of Priscian, who quotes the line, exhibit the same form (*Archiv.* v. p. 405): if then the note of Festus on this word (quatenus significat 'qua fine' ut hactenus hac fine. At quatinus 'quoniam') represents the classical usage (cf. Stolz-Schmalz Lat. Gr. 294), we would here have a small but not insignificant proof of the integrity of the Blandinian codices.

Prof. Mewes' other alterations are for the most part a return to MSS. authority: i. 1, 88 An si cognatos, nullo i. 2, 38 moechis 68 videnti i. 3, 7 Bacchae 130 Alfenus i. 4, 39 poetas 70 sim i. 5, 70 producimus i. 6, 75 octonos . . aeris i. 10, 68 sint ii. 1, 1 videar 31 usquam (but *unquam* 'codex unus').

Most of these readings have already appeared in one or other of the numerous recent editions of the *Satires*, so that anything more than a mere enumeration of them is likely to prove tedious and superfluous here. We may, however, be permitted to call attention to i. 1, 108, a much disputed passage, where Prof. M. has accepted the reading of 'V' with the punctuation and interpretation of Kiessling: 'qui nemo, ut avarus, se probet': 'to return to my enquiry, why no one, through avarice, is satisfied with his own lot.' This view we, for our part, accept with both hands. The *Satire* now gains a unity which it did not possess under any of the previous explanations; its subject is no longer double—'Discontent and Avarice'—but single—'Discontent due to Avarice.' Horace *more suo* (cf. i. 6, 18; C. i. 12, 1) had given no definite reply to the question put in the first line, to which he is here referring, but had allowed the general course of the argument (the adversative *quae* in 36 gives the key-note) to answer it, and that answer he is here in conclusion incidentally repeating. *Ut*=*utpote*, *ὥς ὧν*, is common in Horace, as Prof. M.'s note shows; and the construction of *avarus*, agreeing with *quisque* implied in *nemo*, though harsher

than the similar license in 1—3, will not offend those who feel that the style of the earlier *Sermones* often lacks the 'curiosa felicitas' of the *Odes* and *Epistles*.

On the other hand it is a disappointment to find that on i. 1, 88

At si cognatos nullo natura labore
quos tibi dat retinere velis servareque
amicos,
infelix operam perdas etc.

Prof. M. abandons Orelli's view and reads 'An si,' joining *labore* with *dat*, not *retinere*. This arrangement has somewhat the better MSS. authority in its favour, but it has little else. For to make *infelix* not vocative but predicate, and to ascribe the simile of the ass, not to Horace, but to the 'avarus'—'do you think you would be wasting your labour to no purpose, just as if you were to put a donkey into training'—is to adopt a singularly infelicitous mode of expression, while the clause 'quos tibi dat'—'whom Nature gives you without any trouble (on your own part)'—is not only harsh in grammar, but pointless in sense. But the older view—if you expect to retain the affections even of your natural relations *without taking any trouble about it*, you expect an impossibility—conveys a very serious truth, which Horace may well have learned from Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1, 28, εἴτε ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων ἐθέλεις (cf. *velis*) ἀγαπᾶσθαι, τοὺς φίλους εὐεργετητέον: for that he was familiar with this passage appears from S. i. 9, 60, 'nil sine magno Vita labore dedit mortalibus,' where he literally translates the opening words of the sentence just quoted from Xenophon: οὐδὲν ἄνευ πόνου καὶ ἐπιμελείας θεοὶ διδόναι ἀνθρώποις.

With the exception of Bentley's 'resonant' (MSS. 'resonarent') i. 8, 41, we do not find that Prof. Mewes has anywhere introduced a conjecture into his text; but on i. 6, 19 he adopts a new punctuation, which invites a few words on this, one of the most difficult passages in Horace:

—qui stupet in titulis et imaginibus.
Quid oportet
nos facere a volgo longe longeque
remotos?
Namque esto, populus Laevino mallet
honorem
20 quam Decio mandare novo, censorque
moveret
Appius, ingenuo si non essem patre
natus,
vel merito, quoniam in propria non pello
quiessem.

Sed fulgente trahit constrictos Gloria
curru
non minus ignotos generosis.

Prof. M. punctuates in 19 'namque esto: populus,' explaining 'namque esto pro podosi, apodosis ab *populus* orditur' and adopting the paraphrase of Herbst: 'quid oportet nos facere, qui a vulgo longissime dissentientes non stupemus in titulis et imaginibus? Num, etsi ignobili sumus loco nati, tamen honores petemus? Minime.' Surely this explanation of *esto* and *remotos* is impossible. Horace's words in 17 (qui stupet in titulis) refer to the 'populus' i.e. to the electors; but in 18 he is speaking of himself as a possible candidate, and a candidate, as such, cannot be said either 'stupere' or 'non stupere in imaginibus.' Kiessling then is surely right in comparing ii. 1, 71: 'se a vulgo et scaena in secreta remorat' and explaining the words of a man 'der sich von dem Trieben der Öffentlichkeit des politischen Lebens auf sich selbst zurückgezogen hat und im Dunkeln dahinlebt.' Horace says 'a vulgo (not "populo") remotos,' and he is plainly speaking of himself as an *ignotus*, who has no claims for office, but, far from the madding crowd, lives the 'vita solutorum misera ambitione gravique' (129: cf. 52 'ambitione procul'). Prof. M. urges that '*esto* semper est concedentis et ad praecedentia pertinet': this is true, but it is to 'qui stupet in titulis,' not to 'remotos' that the word here refers. Just as *Ep.* i. 1, 81 (*esto* aliis aliis rebus studiisque teneri) refers to and repeats in a new form ll. 77—80 (pars—sunt qui—multis), so here *esto* resumes ll. 15—17: 'what is a quiet-going nobody like me to do? (I may well ask the question) for, though what I said just now (populus stupet in titulis) is quite true, though it is quite true that the populus (not "vulgus"), in spite of the historical instance I have quoted to the contrary, would as a general rule prefer a Laevinus to a Decius, and that most censors, unlike the exceptional Appius, would eject me from the senate as *ignobilis* (quite right too, since I did not know my place), still I see most "ignoti" carried carried away captive in Gloria's gleaming car.' The true apodosis to *esto*, *mallet* comes

on at l. 23 ('sed fulgente': cf. *S.* ii. 1, 83 '*esto—sed*') and the full stop should be removed from l. 22, which is parenthetical. 'A juvenile taste for parenthesis is the crying sin of the Satires' wrote the late Prof. Maguire (*Hermath.* v. p. 130) and Vahlen (de vers. nonnullis Horat. Berol. 1886) has touched on the same point on *S.* i. 1, 114, which, to the great gain of the context, he has enclosed within brackets as a parenthetical comment on the preceding verse, entirely in the early manner of Horace (cf. i. 6, 57).

In the purely exegetical part of the commentary the hand of the new editor has been less busy in introducing new matter than in removing much that seems superfluous for modern readers, and the result is that the 206 pages of the original Orelli are now reduced to 160. The edition, when complete, will embrace a much-needed 'Lexicon Horatianum,' and to the editor's labours in this direction we may perhaps ascribe the addition of a few valuable notes, mainly of a statistical nature, on points of Horatian usage: *e. gr.* i. 1, 46 (plus ac) 97 (adusque) 101 (mi) i. 2, 77 (quare) 79 (est) i. 3, 81 cum quibus ii. 1, 1 sunt qui. For the rest, the alterations are either occasional notices of important views put forward in recent German editions of Horace, among which it is no surprise to find that Kiessling's learned independent and stimulating work occupies a leading place, or references to handbooks on language or archaeology of better authority than those in use in Orelli's day. In the latter direction an opportunity seems lost on i. 6, 27 (nigris pellibus), where Orelli did not distinguish between the 'senatorius' and 'patricius calceus.' Marquardt (*Privatl.* ii. 573) shows that the latter only, and not the former had the 'lunula,' which, like the 'bulla,' could be worn only by 'ingenui': and the distinction becomes important in this passage of Horace, because if the character here referred to had worn the 'patricius calceus,' the question 'quo patre natus' (29) could not have arisen. A word of praise must in conclusion be said of the type and paper of this important edition which are of a singular beauty.

W. T. LENDRUM.

THE FOURTH VOLUME OF GOETZ'S *CORPUS GLOSSARIORUM LATINORUM*.

Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum vol. iv.
Edidit GEORGIUS GOETZ. Leipzig, Teubner,
1889. 20 Mk.

THE fourth volume of the *Corpus* of Latin glossaries (the second in order of publication) contains (1) the glosses beginning with *abstrusa*, contained in the Vatican MS. 3321, written in uncials in the seventh century; (2) the glosses of the St. Gallen MS. 912 (eighth century), edited with an excellent commentary by Minton Warren in 1885; (3) four separate glossaries from the Leyden MS. 67 F (eighth or ninth century). These are (a) the *abavus* glossary, or glossary beginning with *abavus*; (b) that beginning with *ab absens*; (c) *Glossae Vergilianae*; (d) the *affatim* glossary, half of which is identical with the *abstrusa* glossary of Vat. 3321. An appendix contains specimens (a) of the Ambrosian glossary B 31 and the glossary *asbestos* (MSS. 1469, Monte Cassino 90, 217, 402), both companions to the St. Gallen; (b) of the fuller recension of the *abavus* glossary, or rather the glossary made up of the *abavus* and *absens* combined (Vossianus Fol. 82 and others); (c) of the glossary beginning with *abactor* (Montpellier H 416 and others).

The importance of this book will probably be found to lie in two main points: (1) the critical edition of Vaticanus 3321; (2) the sifting of the manuscript material of the remaining glossaries treated of in the volume.

(1) The text of the Vatican glossary is printed exactly as it stands in the manuscript. At the foot of the page is given an *apparatus* of readings from two Paris manuscripts, the Vatican 6018 and the Monte Cassino 439, which also contain it. The

glossary is important as representing a good tradition in a very corrupt form. It thus gives an excellent notion of the degradation into which classical learning must have sunk in the seventh century A.D. and indeed much earlier, for its corruptions are no doubt, in many cases, older than itself. It is made up out of two more ancient glossaries, which are themselves, in all probability, based upon older work. Thus the Vatican glossary deserves the careful study both of scholars and historians. It will probably be found to supply a link between the learning of the classical period at its close, and that of the incipient middle age. The character of its contents is very mixed; there is much of real value, much again which could only belong to a period of decadence.

(2) The warmest gratitude is due to Dr. Goetz and his *collaborateurs* for their fruitful labours upon the manuscript material of the other and inferior glossaries edited in this volume. Dr. Goetz has carried on and completed much of the work in which Löwe was the brilliant pioneer. Special praise is due to his account (p. xxix foll.) of the eleven manuscripts of the *affatim* glossary and the twenty-one of the fuller or contaminated *abavus* glossary. His lucid classifications have for the first time made it possible for students of Latin glossaries to feel sure of their footing in the weltering chaos of manuscript material collected in the libraries of Europe.

The publication of the manuscript texts without any emendations confers an incidental boon of great value upon students of palaeography.

H. NETTLESHIP.

ESSAYS BY STUDEMUND'S PUPILS.

Commentationes in honorem GULIELMI STUDEMUNDI, quinque abhinc lustra summos in philosophia honores adepti conscripserunt discipuli Gryphisvaldenses, Herbolopolitani, Argentinenses, Vratislavienses. (Argentorati, Heitz, 1889.) 10 Mk.

If the highest satisfaction which a teacher can receive is the gratitude and veneration of former pupils who have made their mark in the world, February 8th of last year must

have been a day of rejoicing to Wilhelm Studemund, in spite of the fact that he knew himself to be suffering from an incurable disease. On this day some hundred of his former pupils—*morituum salutantes*—presented him with this volume, in which are gathered together nineteen essays written by certain of their number and commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of his doctor's degree. The tribute was indeed well deserved: Studemund represented, as a

scholar, the best tendencies of modern Germany. His work was based upon the conviction that advances in textual criticism can be made only by exhaustive examination of the tradition of MSS. on the one hand, and on the other hand by minute observation of the usage of particular authors and particular periods. He was conservative without pedantry or superstition, progressive without temerity or license. In the words of the dedication prefixed to this volume: 'Tu nos docuisti doctrinam non in proponendis coniecturis admodum audacibus et contortis quamvis subtiliter excogitatis, verum neglecta propria ostentatione in sola quaerenda veritate esse positam, neque enim inveniendam litterarum antiquarum memoriam, sed restituendam esse nobis persuasisti.' That he was an ideal teacher, the present volume is the best evidence. 'Numquam de memoria nostra dilabentur congressus illi, ubi fabulas Plautinas tecum legere solebamus, et gratiam habebunt quantum maximam animi capere possunt si quibus procul a patria commorantibus in tua domo Christi natalem celebrare licuit.'

It would be obviously impossible within the limits of a review to do justice to all the essays contained in this volume, dealing as they do with a great variety of subjects. I must content myself with little more than an enumeration of them. The following are the names of the authors and their subjects: 1. ALWIN PREHN, on verbal adjectives in *-bundus*, from the earliest times till the 2nd century A.D.—2. GEORG GEIL, on the μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς in Plato and their relation to the Platonic system.—3. HEINRICH BLASE, on the syntax of conditional sentences in Latin¹.—4. ADOLF CRAMER, on the

¹ In this paper Blase, already known as the author of a valuable treatise on conditional sentences (Argentorati, Teubner, 1885), supplements the treatise of Oskar Brugmann (Ueber den Gebrauch des conditionalen *ni* in der älteren Latinität, Leipzig, 1887) by tracing the origin and development of meaning of the subjunctive in *ni* (*nisi*) clauses subordinate to expressions like *parum est*, *non satis est*. He explains such a sentence as *parumne est malae rei quod amat Demipho, ni sumptuosus insuper etiam siet* (Plaut. Merc. 692) as a case of parataxis, the *ni* clause being a co-ordinate expression of wish: 'Is it not misfortune enough that D. is in love? Would that he were not a spendthrift also!' It is undoubtedly true that *ni* was originally simply a negative particle (cf. *quid ni fleam*, 'why should I not weep?', *quippe ego te ni contemnam*? Pseud. 917, Bacch. 839, Men. 948, 1109 etc.), and everything favours some such account of the origin of the subjunctive mood in such sentences as Merc. 692. But the question remains how far parataxis was felt in the time of Plautus. Considering that in general Plautus uses both *nisi* and *ni* as conditional conjunctions (cf. Mil. 927, Stich. 436) and that in Bacch. 563 ff.* a passage which Blase admits

infinitive in Manilius. Cramer shows, in opposition to Bernhardt and Teuffel, that Manilius does not differ essentially in the use of the infinitive from other authors.—5. LUDWIG VOLTZ, on treatises *περὶ παθῶν τοῦ ἡρώκου μέτρων* (faults in the structure of the dactylic hexameter).—6. PAUL HABEL, on the history of sun worship, introduced at Rome by Elagabalus and Aurelian (especially on the college of *pontifices solis*, created by Aurelian).—7. FRIEDRICH HANSEN, a paper on Latin syntax, on the lines of Paul, continuing the author's subtle philosophico-grammatical article in *Philologus*, Neue Folge, I. on adjectives in *-bilis*. He regards the object as a 'degraded subject' (*fugio hostes = ego fugio + hostes fugiunt: fugio hostes = ego fugio + hostes fugant: doceo artem = ego doceo + ars docet: stillo rorem = ego stillo + ros stillat*), and derives the feminine gender from a collective neuter.—8. GEORG SCHOEMANN, de Etymologici Magni fontibus particula III.: de Diogeniano.—9. OTTO ADALBERT HOFFMANN, on replicas of the Apollo Belvedere under the Empire. He maintains that the statue had a bow in the left hand.—10. WILHELM STERN on the

to be similar to Merc. 692, he uses *nisi*, I think there is no reason to suppose that we have a case of conscious parataxis in these *ni* clauses in Plautus: *ni* had become a subordinating conditional conjunction, precisely equivalent to the *nisi* in similar sentences in Cicero (e.g. Rosc. Amer. § 150 *non satis habet avaritiam suam pecunia exple, nisi etiam crudelitatis sanguis praebitus sit* 'unless an offering of blood be made to his cruelty': cf. Brutus § 110).—In the second part of his paper Blase corrects Schmalz (in Iwan Müller's Handbuch, § 297) on the question of the relative frequency of the form *si* with pres. indic. in protasis, followed by fut. indic. in apodosis, at different periods. Blase would have made his paper more valuable if he had told us in what proportion of his instances the pres. indic. with *si* refers to future time. It is not a matter of much interest to know how often Cicero and others had occasion to write sentences like *si prudens est* (= is now), *veniet*: the question is how often did he use the pres. with the future sense which we find in Terence Ad. 531 (*si hic pernacto = pernacto*), etc.

* This passage (Bacch. 563 ff.) is quoted by Blase in the following form:—

Quid tibi non erat meretricium aliarum Athenis copia

Quibuscum haberes rem, nisi cum illa, quam ego mandassem tibi,

Eam ut occiperes tute amare et mi ires consultum male!

So Ussing and Goetz. In the last line the MSS. have *Occiperes tute amare*, &c. Ritschl supplied the gap by *ipse* after *tute*; but *amare cum aliquo* for *amare aliquem* is an expression for which it would be hard to find a parallel, however extended the use of *cum* in old Latin (cf. Most. 1142 *cavere cum aliquo*, &c., Roby § 1885). I propose to read *Occiperes rem tute habere*, &c., regarding *amare* as a gloss on *rem habere*. *Rem* would easily fall out after *occiperes*.

obligations of Diodorus to Theopompus.—11. ERICH SCHMIDT, a paper of a literary character, on the sources of Goethe's Euphron in the second part of Faust. 12. EDWARD GRUPE, on the authorship of the Institutions of Justinian.—13. EDWARD ZARNCKE, on a catalogue of old MSS. belonging to a library at Murbach and dated 1464; it contains among others the following titles—*Cicero De Arte Grammatica* and *Olibrii bucolicon*. In the latter the author recognises Amicius Hermogenianus Olybrius, who was consul A.D. 395. 14. MAX CONSRUCH, on treatises περί κομωδίας.—15. FRIEDRICH BACK, on a suspected

passage in the Phaedrus of Plato (246 B).—16. FRIEDRICH KUHN, on the date and order of the commentaries of Eustathius.—17. MAX GOLDSTAUB, on the right of dispensation at Athens and Rome.—18. PETER EGENOLFF, on an anonymous Byzantine grammar.—19. WILHELM HAELLINGK, on the real title of the work of Cicero commonly called *De Inventione*. The real title was *Rhetorici (sc. libri)*, as the author shows from the quotations of grammarians and the evidence of the best MSS. of Cicero: cf. *De Orat.* II. 3, 10.

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

SCHAEFER'S MANUAL OF THE SOURCES FOR GREEK HISTORY.

Abriss der Quellenkunde der griechischen und römischen Geschichte, von ARNOLD SCHAEFER: Erste Abteilung—Griechische Geschichte bis auf Polybios. Vierte Auflage, besorgt von Heinrich Nissen. Leipzig, 1889. pp. vi. 118. 2 Mk.

As it is upwards of twenty years since the first edition of this small but scholarly manual appeared, and some seven or eight years since the third edition was issued, it has not previously come within the scope of our crescent *Classical Review* to take stock of the work. Though many students of ancient history are probably acquainted with the *Abriss*, it may not be superfluous to notice the present edition somewhat fully, the rather because the book suggests some reflections upon the methods of teaching history pursued by the Germans as compared with the methods generally employed in *Pan-anglia*—if such a term may be allowed—not wholly to our advantage.

The work consists for the most part of extracts from Greek and Latin texts referring to the authorities for ancient history, combined and set forth in a systematic order. References are given to the best texts and editions of the various authors enumerated, and also to the more important modern works, or monographs, bearing upon authors and subjects. The titles, headings, and connecting paragraphs are in German, but the book is, all the same, eminently serviceable for those unacquainted with German, the great bulk of it consisting of the extracts above mentioned, which tell their own story. To everyone engaged in studying or teaching ancient history these *Outlines*, though slight and not designed to supersede a fuller appre-

ciation of the 'Sources,' may be recommended as a convenient sketch and synopsis of the principal authorities.

It is in the purpose proper of the book, as set forth in the preface, that the superiority of the German method in these matters may be detected. The *Abriss* was designed to serve as a text-book for the lecture-room, and as such it might supply an admirable basis for a fuller exposition and valuation of the whole sum of our sources of knowledge for Greek history. But a thing of that kind can only be acceptable to historical and philological specialists: of such are the German universities, but not ours. The further observation may be allowed, that what the specialist sacrifices in variety and multiplicity of subjects is made up by the sense of totality which comes of leaving no great gaps in his own department, and by his feeling at home there, in a world of order, instead of wandering houseless around a dozen half-explored continents or islands.

Taking this *Abriss* as a basis for class or lecture-room work, or for private study, it would be possible to correct what is its most obvious defect from a scientific standpoint. The authorities are enumerated and characterised in the order of their chronological succession, and not in the order of their relation to the subject. It is true that to some extent the two orders coincide. The earlier historian cannot be an authority for the later period. But all historic composition is not contemporary with its subject, and the later authority may often be the better authority, not in the nature of things, but from character or accident. As it stands at present the *Abriss* forms a synopsis for the literary history of historical composition

among the Greeks, rather than a manual of the sources extant for various periods of Greek history.

The third edition is not at this moment within reach, but comparing the present, or fourth, edition of the Greek division with the second edition (1873), it may fairly be said that the later completely supersedes the earlier edition named. The actual increase in bulk is not indeed great, about ten pages, but the improvement in the arrangement and treatment of the extracts and so forth is considerable. A great gain is the addition of a table of contents (*Inhalt*, pp. iv—vi.). The index (*Register*) contains some sixteen additional entries, but most of these only betoken better indexing—of this more anon. Four names however—Agatharchides, Harpokration, Herakleides Lembos, Kallixenos of Rhodes—stand for real additions to the text. Space has been gained in the body of the work by a freer use of small print for ancillary matters, and great care is shown in the more systematic numbering of paragraphs, in certain rearrangements of extracts, in redistribution of notes or passages, in additions to the Bibliography, and in verbal or material corrections. Instances of all these improvements might be given, but one of special interest, and falling under the last head, must suffice. In the second edition a reference to the Parian marble appeared under the paragraph on Phanias, on the supposition that the chronicle was based upon the work of that author: this reference has now been transferred to the paragraph on Timaeos, no doubt in consequence of Flach's argument (*Chronicon Parium*: Tübingen, 1884).

As every six or seven years the *Abriss* wins apparently a new edition, and as considerable care is employed on the new issues, it may not be amiss to add one or two practical suggestions, and criticisms of less favourable import, for the benefit it may be of future editions. The most important of these concerns the Index, or *Register*. The addition of the table of contents (*Inhalt*) throws the defects of the *Register* into bolder relief. The *Register* is incomplete and inconsistent: it does not contain all the names in the text, nor references to all the pages where the names given are mentioned. It is mainly but not wholly concerned with the primary authorities referred to in the body of the work, and it is not easy to discover any principle upon which the line has been drawn. The omission of Plutarch's name from the Index must not be taken to prove that Plutarch is nowhere referred to in a

work professing to give us a synopsis of the authorities on Greek history. The *Register* in fact has itself a history, and is obviously in process of development. In the earlier editions it had to do duty for a table of contents, and was in the main confined to the authorities to whom separate paragraphs were assigned in the body of the work, and Plutarch *e.g.* was not dignified with a separate paragraph, as he falls outside the limits of the chronological presentation, above referred to as the one drawback in the scheme of the book. The *Register* is becoming more than this, but is not yet a proper index, or under the entry Hellanikos *e.g.* references to every page, where that author is named, would occur. In short there should be at least two *Indices*, one containing the bare list, in alphabetical order, of the authors treated in the work as 'Sources,' and another, containing complete references to all authors, subjects and so forth, noticed in the book. A third Index, presenting a synopsis of the passages quoted, would not be a superfluity. Another suggestion to be made is that the numbering of the paragraphs might be carried further, and rendered more systematic: or is it right that Agatharchides of Knidos should have a separate number (§ 55), while Eratosthenes of Kyrene and Apollodoros of Athens have to go in with a little crowd of lesser lights under the general head of Alexandrine and Pergamene learning (§ 54)? So Aristotle and the whole Peripatetic school have but one figure (§ 47) among them, while Idomeneus of Lampsakos, perhaps on the strength of his being a friend of Epicurus, gets a number (§ 49) to himself; Sicilian history figures as § 44, and Timaeos as § 45. It might be an improvement to number the extracts printed under each paragraph: and it is also a question whether the extracts are marshalled under each paragraph in the best order. Finally it may be observed that it is surprising to be referred on p. 93 to the Berlin papyrus fragment of Aristotle's *'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* without a hint of Diels' edition, and to find an imperfect title for Barclay Head's monumental *Historia Numorum* on p. 4. The reference to Boeckh's *Staatshaushaltung* on p. 3 seems also to leave something to be desired, especially since the publication of a third edition, even though the epigraphic texts have not been reedited by Fränkel. These remarks and suggestions, however, are not intended to depreciate the value of this excellent little manual, and the best testimony to its merits is to be found in the constant demand for new editions.

R. W. MACAN.

BUDGE'S PSEUDO-CALLISTHENES.

The History of Alexander the Great; being the Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Callisthenes; edited with an English translation and notes by E. A. W. BUDGE, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1889. 25s.

If a wide circulation is any test of the merits of a book, the romantic history of Alexander, falsely ascribed to Callisthenes, must be one of the best books in the world; for few, to which no sort of sanctity attaches, have been translated into so many languages, or have experienced so many vicissitudes. Alexander the Great was the one Greek who altered the face of the East: hence the anxiety of the Eastern peoples to know all about him. Now to these readers a dry and veracious narrative would have possessed neither probability nor interest; but a book like that of the Pseudo-Callisthenes abounding with gross exaggerations, inaccuracies, wise saws and edifying anecdotes was entirely to their taste. And that it has not lost its attractiveness to the Oriental mind is proved by the observations of the Armenian editor, who in his preface suggests that it was in part at least written by Aristotle, and that its author was, as a master of the historical art, scarcely inferior to the great historians, Diodorus, Thucydides and Herodotus. With this high estimate of the Pseudo-Callisthenes not all readers will agree; but about the merits of the editor and translator of the Syriac text there will not be two opinions. Mr Budge's book bears all over it the signs of masterliness; his scholarship in Greek and Syriac is excellent beyond question; his extraordinarily wide command of Oriental learning enables him to illustrate his author from sources open collectively to few, if any, besides himself; and his English translation, while absolutely accurate, is spirited and felicitous. The beauty of the Syriac printing also makes the book a credit to the Cambridge Press; and the work in general suggests a hope that, although the sceptre of Semitic study has by the death of Professor Wright been removed from England, he has left those behind him who will speedily bring it back.

It is clear to any one who reads but a few pages of the Syriac text that this translation cannot have been made directly from a Greek copy, but must come from some secondary source. For the Greek names, which Syriac translators usually represent with great accuracy, are here for the most part mutilated

beyond recognition. Mr. Budge is likely to have good grounds for everything that he does; yet why he keeps these monstrosities in his translation, where the Greek text tells the truth, is something of a puzzle. p. 140 *Aridaeus the son of Philip* becomes *Belirōs son of Mitekōs*; p. 62 for *Hermes, the boxer Polydeukes and Alcides* we read *Polynicus, Antimachus, and Tarkates*. Professor Wright thought that the translator followed an Arabic original; this would be an adequate account of the mutilations (see p. lxi.), for Arabic copyists often mangle Greek names hopelessly. Yet, unless I am mistaken, the book tells us plainly that it is made from a Persian original. For how else are the numerous Persian glosses to be accounted for? On p. 9 after the name of each planet we are told what the Persian for it is; surely this implies that the book which the translator had before him was in Persian. I will quote one of these, because Mr. Budge has by accident missed the truth. The name of *Saturn* is omitted from the list, and instead we read *the colour* 𐭪𐭥𐭥𐭥 *of a*

black stone; and the Horoscopus of helānē, which is called in Persian Farnūg. Mr. Budge would emend *Farnūg*, but it is a Persian word, signifying *Saturn*; given in Meninski's dictionary, and in one published at Calcutta in 1804, but omitted in the 'Seven Seas,' and thence not in Vullers. Hence 𐭪𐭥𐭥𐭥 'colour' must stand for a word

meaning *Saturn*; and this will be the Persian کيوان, which the translator has read

کُون 'colour.' The words *which is called in Persian Farnūg* should then be placed immediately after this word. The assumption of a Persian original will also account (2) for certain Persisms, such as 𐭪𐭥𐭥𐭥 of p. 8,

which is the Persian سبت 'a basket' (again omitted by Vullers), and need not be emended; and (3) for the form which certain names assume; thus *Roxana* is always called *Rushnak*, which is the name by which she is known to Firdousi and Nizāmī; and of the Satraps whose Greek names are Ὑστάσιος and Σφρυγίππ, but whose Persian names are *Gushtasp* and *Afendiyār* (Firdousi, ed. Macan iii. p. 1278), the former is given his Persian name by the Syrian translator (p. 89). Perhaps too (4) a certain number of the differences between the Greek and the Syriac version may be accounted for by

Persian words misread or misunderstood. On p. 36 we read that *Alexander is in his wisdom adequate to take and to give*, i.e. 'to transact business.' The Greek fails here, but the Armenian translation has to choose (*ëntrel*) and to judge (*datel*), i.e. αἰεῖσθαι καὶ κρίνειν, which is the sense required. The translation of the former word by *to take* is quite natural; but *to give* seems to be from a reading دادن for داد. On p. 56 the Greek has τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ Δαρείου, the Syriac for *lands and water*; perhaps دارا has been read دریا 'sea.' On p. 32 for *years* of the Greek there is an unintelligible σαλῆ; perhaps this is the Persian sālān, which means 'years.' On p. 58 for ὑπερασπιστῶν the Syriac has *a horse*; may we not trace here the Persian asp? This is not the place to pursue these observations, but it may be added that the Persian variety of the Arabic alphabet will fully explain the mutilations of the Greek names. This Persian translation was probably the copy employed by Firdousi; for the account of Alexander's visit to China (p. 195 and following), only found in the Syriac version, is very closely followed by the Persian poet (*Shahnameh*, ed. Macan iii. p. 1347). The Persian translation must however have been nearer the Greek than its Syriac daughter, as may be seen from the extract in Vullers' *Chrestomathia Shahnamiāna*, where l. 105 corresponds with τοὺς πόρους ἀραιεῦν of the Greek (Müller p. 70 b 5), which is not represented in the Syriac; yet a little lower down there occur in Firdousi some words found in the Syriac (p. 131. 13), but not in the Greek. The comparison with Firdousi, which must necessarily give the literary critic a high idea of that poet's skill, ability and taste, will only involve the textual critic in fresh puzzles.

It will be a further question whether the Persian was made directly from the Greek, or from a secondary translation; the latter would *a priori* be more probable, but Mr. Budge's Syriac seems to adhere to the Greek too closely in parts to allow of such a hypothesis. But the use of the Syriac for critical purposes is considerably vitiated by the fact that the critic must reconstruct the text in another language before he can employ it. It would seem easier too to obtain from it new corruptions of the Greek than new emendations; the following passage will both illustrate the truth of this, and also serve as a specimen of the translator's common sense (p. 36): *from thence he returned and came to the stag, and he found a large*

mound, and fifteen towns (rather *villages*) *lay around it*; there follow *twelve* names of villages hideously corrupted, one of which is said to be *in the centre of the mound*. Here the stag represents (as Mr. Budge observes) ἔλαφον for ἰδιόφους, and the mound χῶμα for χώρημα bis. At the beginning of this chapter the name Παράτορον is derived from a *false shot*. The Syriac translator tells a grossly improbable story, and says the place was called *one who died without pain* (παρὰ πόνον).

If we eliminate (1) the errors to be explained by corruption of the Greek, (2) the errors to be explained from the intermediate translation, there remains a text marked by the same characteristic as the remaining MSS. and versions of this curious book; in other words, a recension so independent as almost to be reckoned another book. To the six independent recensions already known (Müller's three, Meusel's, the Latin and the Armenian) this adds a seventh, containing a great deal of fresh matter, omitting much, and agreeing with each of the other authorities occasionally, but with none consistently. It is probable that all the additions, with trivial exceptions, are derived from Greek sources: and indeed there is some curious evidence of this in the longest addition. On p. 204 we read the name of a river *Pratiçitas*, of which the Persian interpretation is *crystal* (according to Mr. Budge's certain correction). Now *Pratiçitas* is a Sanskrit word, which probably meant *frozen*; the Greek gloss of this was therefore κρύσταλλος, by which the writer meant *ice*, but which the translator interpreted wrongly. From this we can restore the name of another river mentioned on pp. 193 and 196 as *Praçitas*, which also in Sanskrit means *frozen*, and is rather more common than the other. Assuredly these must be long-lived words to have remained whole through three transliterations.

Mr. Budge fancies that the differences between the recensions are to be explained as due to arbitrary treatment of the text; and this version gives some curious illustrations of the way in which readers of the book exercised their wit in interpolating it. When Alexander brings on his shoulders the body of the dead Nectanebus, the best authorities, the Armenian and Latin, put no jest in Olympias' mouth; Müller's text makes her call him *a new Aeneas*; the Syriac retains the jest about Aeneas in Alexander's answer, but in the mouth of Olympias puts the new joke *a second Telamonian Ajax*, as Mr. Budge has acutely

restored the passage. As Olympias did not know that it was the body of his father, it was fitter for her to compare him to Ajax carrying the body of Achilles than to Aeneas. The ridiculous account of the Olympic games has been spun out by similar ingenuity, but the translator's blunders have rendered much of it unintelligible.

To the question of the origin of the book Mr. Budge makes a brilliant contribution, tracing the magical rites which Nectanebus practices in Egyptian documents which he for the first time edits and translates. In this field the present writer cannot follow him. Mr. Budge does not however insist that the book was originally written in Egyptian, although he thinks it likely. Against this theory we may notice that the quotations from Homer, which are omitted by the Syriac translator, are to be found in the Armenian, which, according to Zacher,

is the most original authority. Perhaps therefore the theory which other scholars hold, that Greek was not the native language of the writer, is more likely; and the construction of iii. 24 *ἐνθα εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Καρδαύλης τοῖς θεοῖς ἐκεῖ διατῆσθαι* would suggest that this was some form of Semitic or Coptic. Mr. Budge has rendered his work as useful as it was possible to make it to Greek scholars by his accurate translation, his excellent comparative table of contents, his analysis of the Aethiopic version, and his full bibliographical details; and he has therefore provided a model for other editors of Oriental versions, to which few will be able to attain. In taking leave of his excellent book I will venture to congratulate him warmly on having so well sustained the reputation of his lamented master and his own.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

GOODWIN'S MOODS AND TENSES.

Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. By W. W. GOODWIN, LL.D., Eliot Professor of Greek Literature in Harvard University. New edition, re-written and enlarged. (Macmillan, 1889.) Pp. xxxii. 464. 14s.

THIS volume, as Mr. Goodwin tells us in the preface, was begun as a revision of the well-known book published by him in 1860; but as he proceeded he found that it must inevitably become a new and independent work. Much, certainly, has been done in the way of enlargement, and the brilliant essay of thirty years ago has assumed the form and character of a standard work. Yet it is in essentials the same book. One reviewer, indeed, has assured us that it is a book in which 'the student may reckon up the results of the prodigiously minute investigations which German scholars have made during the last quarter of a century into the forms and history of the Greek verb.' But the description is far from being a happy one. Mr. Goodwin's book owes very little to German research. In his first edition he professed himself in the main a follower of Madvig, who did so much to release Greek syntax from the network of metaphysics in which it was then the tendency of German writers to involve themselves. Mr. Goodwin brought to his subject what he modestly called the light of 'com-

mon sense.' We should rather say that he brought to it the faculties which we are accustomed to speak of as 'scholarship,' something that is not exactly either 'learning' or 'science,' but rather a trained sense and knowledge of language as it is used by great writers, without undue leaning either to the logical or to the artistic side. The views which Mr. Goodwin then put forward were in several points new, and we may even say bold, if that term can be applied to conclusions that rest upon sufficient evidence. Since that time the historical treatment of language has been extended to syntax, and the basis of the science has been proportionately widened. It might have been expected that this great enlargement of view—in which Germany has unquestionably taken the chief part—would have been fatal alike to the 'common-sense' syntax of Madvig and Goodwin and to the metaphysical syntax of the older German grammarians. It is no slight proof of the value of Mr. Goodwin's work that with all the additions and amplifications which it has undergone there has been nothing of importance to correct or withdraw. The new discoveries have fallen into their place—*πάντα γὰρ συνάδει τῷ ἀληθεῖ*—harmonising and illustrating the doctrines already set forth.

The Moods occupy much the larger part of the book; but the Tenses naturally take the earlier place in the order of exposition.

First comes the all-important distinction between the *time* of an action as *present*, *past*, or *future*, and its *character* as *going on*, *finished*, or simply taking place. The former point of view furnishes the division into *primary* and *secondary* tenses. Here a question may be raised. Mr. Goodwin bids us note that the 'historic present' is a secondary tense, and the 'gnomic aorist' a primary tense. But surely it is better to treat the classification as one of tenses, not of the uses of tenses. The historic present is still a present: if it is used to describe a past event, that is a rhetorical artifice, by which we are called upon to imagine for the moment that the event is happening before our eyes. The issue is perhaps a verbal one; but it is worth notice as illustrating a group of usages, the essential feature of which is that the speaker does not express himself with literal directness—where the grammatical meaning is not the real meaning. Other examples will be found in Mr. Goodwin's book (§§ 61, 62, 67, 404, 467).

The problem of the aorist is disposed of briefly, but in a manner which Greek scholars will feel to be satisfactory. The 'fundamental idea of *simple occurrence*' will explain all, or very nearly all, the varieties of usage that we find in Greek. It is true that when we go back to the aorists of Vedic Sanskrit, as they have been explained for us by Delbrück, the formula 'simple occurrence' ceases to satisfy. The peculiar Vedic use of the aorist to relate an event which has *just happened* is distinct from the ordinary Greek use, and can hardly be derived from it. Moreover, this use is not unknown in Greek, as we may see from examples given by Mr. Goodwin (§§ 58, 60, 61, 62). It is especially to be seen in verbs that use the perfect in the sense of a present, as *ἐκτηράμην*, 'I have acquired,' but *κέκτημαι*, 'I possess.'

In Greek, however, we do not feel that these mere traces of a different sense of the aorist are important enough to affect the general theory of the tense. Mr. Goodwin is justly suspicious of attempts to find a distinct meaning whenever an imperfect is used instead of an aorist, or *vice versa*. In some we may think him too sceptical. Thus he instances *κελεύω*, 'I command,' as a verb in which the distinction of tense can seldom be important. Usually, however, as Mr. Jebb points out (*Attic Orators*, p. 362), *ἐκέλευον* is = 'I requested' or 'invited,' *ἐκέλευσα*, 'I commanded.' It is possible that the reason of a difference of tense may still be detected in cases where it is not at present obvious.

On the future it may be suggested that the interrogative use to express *doubt* (§ 68) is a case of the future of *present intention*, &c. (§ 71).

The discussion of the aorist infinitive (§ 127) raises a question of Homeric textual criticism on which opinion will probably be divided. When we find in *Od.* xx. 121 *φάτο γὰρ τίσασθαι ἀλείτας*, 'he thought he should punish the offenders,' what weight has the passage as an instance of the aorist after *φημί*? Madvig would read *τίσεσθαι*, and this is strongly supported by the fact that in *Il.* iii. 28 Ven. A. has *φάτο γὰρ τίσεσθαι*. But even without this there is much to be said for Madvig's emendation. The question is, Can the manuscripts decide in such a case between two forms of the same metrical value? If we do not look at each passage by itself, but observe the state of the readings in all similar passages, we find a large amount of variation. Further, there is evidence that that variation goes back to the earliest Alexandrian times (see the Scholia on *Il.* xxii. 118, *Od.* ii. 373). But if the scribes of the 4th century B.C. were uncertain whether to write *-ασθαι* or *-εσθαι*, how can MSS. of the 10th or 12th century A.D. be of any weight on one side or the other? We have seen that the MSS. of the *Odyssey* all give us *τίσασθαι*, while the MSS. of the *Iliad* are divided, the best giving *τίσεσθαι*. This evidently does not mean that in the *Odyssey* *τίσασθαι* is right; it means that the inferior MSS. of the *Odyssey* have arrived at an accidental unanimity, where the better evidence of Ven. A. shows that there was formerly divergence. So far, then, we may go with Madvig. But there are one or two cases in which an aorist might be defended on grounds which he (and Cobet, who has adopted his view) seem not to have sufficiently recognised. The phrase *φάτο τίσασθαι* might mean 'he thought he had punished,' i.e. that he had gained a victory, which was equivalent to punishing. Or the aorist may express *obligation* or *necessity*; as in *Il.* iii. 98, *φρονέω διακρινθήμεναι*, 'I think that they *should* be parted' (so *Il.* xiii. 262, &c.). Or the aorist may be idiomatically used for the present or future, as in *Od.* ix. 496, *φάμεν αὐτόθ' ὀλέσθαι*, 'we thought we were lost' (we said *ἀπωλόμεθα*). This will apply (e.g.) to Mr. Goodwin's instance from *Xen. Cyr.* iv. 3. 15, *νομίζω, ἢ ἰππεὺς γένομαι, ἄνθρωπος πτηρὸς γενέσθαι*, 'I consider that if I am on horseback I am *ipso facto* winged' (*πτηρὸς ἐγενόμην*).

When we come to the Moods it is hard to choose among the various points to which

one would wish to call attention. In view of recent discussions perhaps the most interesting is the question of *εἰ* with the optative, to which Mr. Goodwin has devoted a special appendix, chiefly directed against the theory of L. Lange. That theory, as is well known, is an ingenious attempt to resolve the conditional sentence into the simple elements out of which it was formed. Any such attempt, it is obvious, must deal with two problems: (1) what is the fundamental or original meaning of the moods used in conditional sentences, and (2) what is the original force of the particle *εἰ*. The first of these problems was treated by Delbrück in his *Syntaktische Forschungen*, his conclusion being that the optative was originally the mood of *wish*. The second was taken in hand by Lange. Although writing under the impulse of Delbrück's researches, Lange did not adopt his view of the optative. His main contention is that *εἰ* is not a temporal or relational particle, but a sort of interjection; so that *εἰ ἔλθοι* meant not 'if' or 'when he may come,' but simply 'may he come' (wish), or 'he may come' (supposition). The most striking result of this view is that *εἰ ἔλθοι* when used as a form of wish is not a conditional protasis with suppressed apodosis—'if he would come (*it would be well*)'—but is an independent sentence containing an optative of wish. Evidently the two theories might be combined: we might hold with Delbrück that *ἔλθοι* of supposition comes from *ἔλθοι* of wish, and with Lange that *εἰ ἔλθοι* of wish comes directly from *ἔλθοι* of wish, not through *εἰ ἔλθοι* of supposition. Indeed it is this combination against which Mr. Goodwin directs his chief attack, though he warns us that it does not represent Lange's own view. Now, however (as Mr. Goodwin is careful to tell us), Delbrück has given up the attempt to derive all uses of the optative from the optative of wish. What view, then, still holds the field? The main value of

Lange's theory is supposed to lie in its getting rid of the notion of an ellipse—in its explaining the complex from the simple, not *vice versa*. But what does this now amount to? If there is an original *εἰ ἔλθοι* of *supposition* we need hardly ask whether an apodosis is understood or not: for a supposition is made with a view to some more or less distinctly conceived *consequence*. If again we find *εἰ ἔλθοι* expressing wish, what do we gain by refusing to connect it with the other *εἰ ἔλθοι*? The only result is the paradox that the single form *εἰ ἔλθοι* has two radically distinct meanings, supposition and wish, while the two forms *ἔλθοι* and *εἰ ἔλθοι* are essentially the same. On this ground, as well as for the reasons urged by Mr. Goodwin, Lange's ingenious speculation must be pronounced unsatisfactory.

Another case in which the notion of an older 'parataxis' is resorted to is the account of *πρὶν* with the subjunctive (§ 624). 'In a sentence like οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις πρὶν καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο πάθῃσθα we have only to remove the colon and make *πρὶν* a conjunction to obtain the regular construction of *πρὶν* with the subjunctive.' Simple as this appears it may be doubted whether it is correct. The use of the subjunctive without *ἄν* or *κε* as a future is extremely rare: it occurs only in the phrase καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησι. On the other hand, the subjunctive after *πρὶν* never takes *ἄν* or *κε* in Homer. It seems hard, then, to explain the latter subjunctive from the former. Moreover the sentences *you will not raise him before you suffer* and *you will not raise him, you will suffer before (you do)*, though they come to nearly the same thing, are utterly different in form, and it is hard to imagine one passing insensibly into the other. On this point then it seems necessary to claim the rare luxury of differing from Mr. Goodwin.

D. B. MONRO.

WAYS'S ILIAD.

The Iliad of Homer. Done into English Verse, by ARTHUR S. WAY, M.A., Head Master of Wesley College, Melbourne, Australia. London: Sampson Low, Books VII. to XII. pp. 313. 1886. 5s.
The same. Books XIII.-XXIV. pp. 335. 1888. 9s.

We have delayed longer than we ought the

review of these volumes in the hope of getting at Part I., Books I.-VI., which may contain some prolegomena or statement of the translator's views on the most interesting question 'How should Homer be translated?' Determined to delay our duty no longer, we must write our review without such helps.

It is now twenty-nine years since Matthew Arnold published his three lectures on

'Translating Homer'—a few years later appeared his 'last words.' In the interval, there have been published at least seven verse translations of the *Iliad*—of the *Odyssey* as a separate poem Mr. Arnold says little—Dean Alford's, Mr. Bryant's, Mr. Dart's, Lord Derby's, Sir John Herschel's, Dean Merivale's and this of Mr. Way's. We write this list off without pausing to think—there may have been as many more. Very few if any of these have troubled themselves about Mr. Arnold's ideas; and a good deal of censure, serious and jocose, has been poured upon him. Yet after all the foam and froth of angry critics has disappeared, it is hard to see that they have shaken one of his four main assertions.

These are: Homer is eminently *rapid*; his lines constantly carry us on; Homer is *simple and straightforward in diction*; we do not constantly have to halt, as in Pindar, to see what a word or a phrase means: Homer is eminently *straightforward in thought*; he does not, like Aeschylus, make us work and work again and again to find out what the sentiment of his lines is; and, finally, he is preeminently grand and noble and he does not, like Catullus, or even Dante, let us down into regions where the poet should close his eyes. Accepting all these four points, we should wish to add another which is perhaps implied in the first and fourth: Homer is eminently musical; he is not only rapid but charming to read, he contains none of such lines as those where Milton broke a string of his lyre, and did not immediately get a new one.

Mr. Way has determined to observe the first requirement faithfully. He recognizes fully the inherent characteristic of Homer, the flow, rush, sweep, go, which is so inevitably lost in all blank verse translations, from innate delay of that kind of metre. It sometimes seems as if Lord Derby and Mr. Bryant never would get there. Mr. Way is bound to get there, and not only so but to get there just as fast as Homer does—a line for every line, and a word, or at least a phrase, for every word and phrase in the line. And what is the result? We take two passages by selection—two by having the volumes opened twice at random.

First, then, the sudden consternation brought by Zeus upon the Achæan army (*Iliad* VIII. 66).

Now all through the morning tide and still while the day waxed hot
Fast fell the folk as the shafts from host unto host were shot;
But so soon as the sun bestrode the midmost height of the sky,

Then hung All Father his golden Balances forth from on high.
And therein two tokens of doom of the outstretcher Death he laid
For the horsequelling Trojans and men of Achæa brazen arrayed.
By the midst did he grasp them and raise, then—sank the doom-fraught day
Of the sons of Achæa and low on the earth all bountiful lay:
But the fates of the people of Troy soared up to the broad-arched heaven
And he sent forth the voice of his thunder from Ida and flashed his levin
Over the men of the host of Achæa, and all they saw And marvelled, and pale grew their faces, and thrilled were their spirits with awe.

Let us take as a second instance the beginning of Achilles' answer to Ulysses refusing Agamemnon's gifts (*Iliad* IX. 307).

Made answer Achilles to him, and the fleet-footed hero replied,
O Scion of Zeus and Laertes, Odysseus in wiles deep tried,
Clear spoken this word of mine answer must be, and I may not feign;
I must tell you the thought of my soul, and the thing that shall surely remain.
For hateful to me is the man as the very gates of Death
Who hideth a thing in his heart that is not as the thing he saith.
But for me, I will utter the thing that I deem shall be best in the end,
Not me shall the son of Atreus, the king Agamemnon, bend,
Nor the rest of the Danaan men: for a thankless task hath it been
To grapple with foes ever more in the battle sleepless keen.
One share hath the home abider, and he that hath fought with his might,
In the self-same honor the dastard is held, and the valiant in fight.
And how dieth the deedless man? as the deed-crowned heroes die.

Take as a third specimen Ajax's immortal prayer for light (*Iliad* XVII. 640).

'Now would there were one of our comrades with uttermost speed to bear
Tidings to Peleus' son, for I ween he is nowise ware
Of the woeful tale that his dear loved friend is dead to-day:
Howbeit such man I can nowhere discern mid Achæa's array:
For in gloom they are shrouded around, e'en they and their steeds withal;
Zeus, father, yet save thou Achæa's sons from beneath its pall
And make clear day, and vouchsafe unto us with our eyes to see:
So it be but in light, destroy us! since this is well pleasing to thee.
He spake, and All Father was moved with compassion for him as he wept.
And he straightway scattered the gloom, and the mist aside he hath swept.'

Take last the description of the case of Patroclus' body (*Iliad* XVIII 343).

'So spake Achilles the godlike and gave to his comrades command
To set a mighty tripod over the fire to stand
That with speed they should cleanse from Patroclus
the clotted gore away :
And the tripod of washing above the devouring fire
set they ;
And they poured the water therein, and they kindled
the billets below ;
And the flames coiled round it, the water grew warm
in the fervent glow.
So when in the glittering brass the water with heat
'gan boil,
Then did they wash the corpse and anointed it over
with oil.
And the wounds of the dead did they fill with ointment
fresh and sweet ;
And laid on a bier and swathed him in linen soft to
the feet
Even from the head and over a white pall have they
thrown.'

What first strikes every reader of these passages is the very novel metre in which they are written ; it is a rhymed anapaestic trimeter acatalectic, with free spondaic—in truth iambic—substitutions. It is precisely Aristophanes' gorgeous metre minus a foot and a syllable. It is obviously selected, or rather invented, by Mr. Way to reproduce Homer's six accents. Nor is it without its recommendations. The anapaest skilfully handled is eminently suited to the genius of the English language—more so, we believe, than that of the French, which makes far greater use of it. There cannot be a more thoroughly English poem than 'Lochiel's Warning,' which is pure anapaestic, with only occasional spondees in the first foot. So too Byron's 'Siege of Corinth' has a freedom and a swing which is wanting even in the 'Corsair.'

Again, we believe there is sense in the use of rhyme. Rhyme in modern languages is the substitute for quantity in the ancient in giving complexity, variety and character to poetry. That every language in Europe including Mediaeval Latin and Modern Greek has drifted into it, seems a sufficient proof of this. In all blank verse translations from the classics we have a feeling of austerity, a want of richness ; this rhyme supplies.

But to return to our first canon. Mr. Way's lines are generally rapid—one does get ahead ; one is not held back as by Cowper, Lord Derby, and Mr. Bryant. But what kind of rapidity is it ? Being rapid, is it easy, harmonious, musical ? Alas ! it is the rapidity of a waggon, rattling down a half-made mountain road, bouncing over stones, swinging around corners, with a driver who is bound to get you there all safe, but kills you with fear every other rod. It is neither flowing, gliding, rushing nor leaping,

but mere bouncing. Now in Homer there is one bouncing line—that of the stone of Sisyphus ; and its leaps are soft compared to Mr. Way's jolts. It is needless to say that under such driving not only the music but the nobility is lost every minute ; even when the verse is easiest, there is a sensation of bustle about the whole. This is fatal in a translation of Homer. To him as to every great poet belongs the attribute of supreme control over their verse. It may have taken them long to bring to perfection ; but it is at last the work of their hand done according to their will, and reflecting their great soul. In inferior poets we are constantly offended by their feeling that words either were lacking or were obtrusive. Persius cannot say all he wishes to ; Ovid is carried off by his too exuberant vocabulary. May we not venture to say that some modern poets of high reputation are destined to a secondary immortality only, because they will fill their verses with queeresses or prettinesses that Horace's self-control would have stabbed in their cradle out of sight of men ?

Mr. Way's lines are filled with these words and phrases which are either forced upon him through his painful anxiety to omit nothing or, still worse, recommended to him by a taste for quaintness and conceits. Homer's epithets have always been a puzzle to translators. The English language does not form compounds easily ; and even if successfully formed, the compound claims far more importance than belongs to the Homeric epithet. *Πόδας ὀκνέω* or *ἐλκεσίτεπλος* are no more, as Macaulay shows, than 'gay ladies' or 'red gold' in early ballads. But Mr. Way's 'the outstretcher death' is to our ear quite different from *τανηλεγίος θανάτοιον*. 'Grim death' may not translate *τανηλεγίος*, but it comes much nearer to holding the same place in English verse than the other does in Greek. 'The outstretcher' is a token struck to meet Mr. Way's exigencies. A worse fault is the affected archaism of such a translation as we find in *Iliad* xvii. 112, where Menelaus is compared to a lion : *ἀέκων δέ τ' ἔβη ἀπὸ μεσσαιόλου*, 'and against his will from the farmyard away he goes.' Here Mr. Way has 'And exceeding loth from the garth doth he backward fare.' We may grant that *μέσσαιλος* is a hard word ; but *garth* is three times harder, because it involves dialectic study to understand. So *ἔβη* = simply 'goes'—is not 'backward fare,' for *fare* meaning to *go* is now exclusively a poetic word, and out of place in translating one of the plainest prose words in Greek ;

these two, joined to 'exceeding loth'—perfectly intelligible, but still entirely out of ordinary speech—make the whole a forced, unnatural rendering of Homer's absolutely simple line.

Mr. Way then violates Mr. Arnold's second canon; he is not straightforward in his words and phrases. Following his own impossible law of giving to Homer a word or phrase equivalent to every one of the original, he loads his verse with invented and obsolete words, wholly wanting in Homer's direct simplicity.

The third canon—that Homer's plainness and directness of thought as well as language must be kept—is generally observed from the compulsion of Mr. Way's verse; one who strives to give line for line cannot have much room to recast or bolster out the conception of the poet. But the fourth passage quoted will show one bad blunder of grammar frequently recurring that sounds more like a German trying to write English. A succession of aorists has its last one translated by the perfect with 'have,' upsetting poetry and grammar at once. In the same passage *ἔπειδ' ἔξασεν ὕδωρ* is translated, 'when the water 'gan to boil' (Mr. Way does not apparently know that *gan* needs no apostrophe)—which would be by no means the time to wash the body. Surely the aorist with *ἔπειδ'* must mean, 'after the water was boiling' or 'as soon as it was boiling.'

We have not sought for lines to condemn. As was said above, every one of the passages selected was chosen from the Greek *Iliad*—two at random, and two for their acknowledged excellence. If we had been on the look out to make a collection of Mr. Way's eccentricities we could easily have produced some startling exhibitions of uncouth English, unreadable lines and versions much more obtrusively un-Homeric than those we give. The translation has evidently been written under the inspiration of Homer's fire and a conscientious wish that the English reader shall have him as nearly as possible as he is,—in cadences, tone, words and thoughts. A skilful elocutionist could read passages of the version so as to produce a great effect on an audience.

But the whole seems to us a failure, by reason of its tone being entirely alien from Homer's or any other extant Greek poetry. It lacks simplicity, and it lacks self-control,

that divine *σωφροσύνη*, which never left any Greek poet's mind—unless it were Archilochus—even in telling the simplest story in the plainest manner and under the strongest passion. Mr. Way's version, in his eagerness to be exact is artificial to the point of torture, and in his determination to be spirited reckless to the point of wildness.

Whether there ever will be an English translation of the *Iliad* which scholars can accept and the people will read, is hard to say. In the first quarter of this century, a New England farmer's book-shelf, which was crammed if it had fifty volumes, was sure to have Pope's Homer. There the boys and girls, whose daily occupation was one of almost unmitigated toil and hardship of the most sordid kind, learned the 'tale of Troy divine.' They learned it in a version easy, melodious, and spirited, where Achilles and Hector, Ulysses and Apollo, spoke to them with the reality which they do in the transcendent original. A scholar will make short work of Pope; a modern poet scarcely admits him to the sacred company; but it will be very long before any translator will make Homer the reality that Pope did to our fathers and grandfathers.

But when the translator comes, he will not do his work thinking all the time of scholar and people; he will not be talking to himself constantly either of Matthew Arnold's canons or the attacks upon them. He will mind neither tradition nor fashion; but one question he will put mercilessly to himself at the end of every line and passage—'Does this really give what I think of Homer; does it reproduce at all the living narrative, the speaking characters, the melody like ocean ripples in a summer evening, the grandeur like the same ocean under a winter storm, the vividness more than mirror or photograph, the reality that pierces straight to the heart like a father's approval or rebuke; in short do I—I the daring translator—feel in my version something of that which made Dante, through the person of Virgil, call Homer, "poeta sovrano"?'—and by that stern test will he correct, improve, destroy or retain his work till it shall be worthy not only of its mighty original, but of the two glorious tongues from which and into which his translation is made.

WILLIAM EVERETT.
Quincy, Mass.

Demosthenes, On the Peace, Philippic II., On the Chersonese, Philippic III. With Introduction and Notes by EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., and P. E. MATHESON, M.A. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1890. pp. 116, 86. 4s. 6d.

THIS is the second volume of the collaborators' school edition of the orations against Philip. The previous volume, which appeared in 1887, was noticed at p. 207 of vol. 2 of this *Review*. The new book is marked by the few faults and the many excellences to which Prof. Butcher drew attention in its predecessor. The notes are short and pertinent; and, assuming that the right method is to give all opinions cut and dried, without stating the grounds on which they are based, the thing could scarcely be better done than it is here. Any edition of Demosthenes which includes the Third Philippic must contain some discussion of the much disputed text of that speech. The brief remarks offered by the editors on pp. 114—116 are of the same perfunctory character that marks all the textual criticism of this edition. If any conclusions were to be stated at all, a list of the different theories should have been given. Instead of this, we have merely a reference to 'Rehdantz "*Philippische Reden*," Weil "*Les Harangues de Démosthène*," Dräseke in *Jahrbuch der Class. Phil. Suppl.* Bd. 7.' No mention of Schultz, whose find of the Laurentian materially affected the discussion: no reference to Spengel, who started the theory that Demosthenes first wrote the shorter version, which is that contained in Σ . pr., and L. pr., and subsequently expanded it into the version which is obtained by relieving the other MSS. of some obvious interpolations: no mention of Dindorf and Vömel, whose view was that Demosthenes wrote the longer version, which was subsequently cut down by a commentator into the form in which it appears in Σ . pr. Weil's conclusion indeed, that the longer text is the result of the union of two parallel versions both due to Demosthenes, is stated, but it is not added that Dräseke strongly combats this theory. The latter's conclusion is that the twelfth century additions in Σ are genuine, and the editors should certainly have given in their footnotes all the passages which Dräseke claims as Demosthenes' work. But this is not always done; e.g. at § 45, where ἀλλ' εὐαγὲς ἢ τὸ ἀποκτείνειν, which Dräseke defends, is entirely omitted. The question of the text of the Third Philippic is one of great importance, as it widely affects the whole theory of interpolations in ancient authors. If we had not Σ and L, we should never have suspected many passages in this speech which are generally rejected. It is quite possible that if we had any MSS. of Thucydides as good as Σ and L we should discover that many passages were wanting in them which appear in all extant MSS. The text is printed from Bekker's stereotyped edition, and the only variants recorded are those of Bekker, ed. i, Dindorf and the Zurich editors. Thus Blass' exceedingly valuable text is entirely ignored.¹

An oppressive melancholy pervades all the speeches against Philip, which makes them rather heavy for school reading. The volume would have been made more attractive if the editors had included a study of the literary aspect of the speeches and of the personal character of their author. It was Demos-

thenes' character that Niebuhr said we ought to study more than anything else in his speeches. His character is unassailable; but it is impossible to feel so certain about his policy. The admirable Introduction traces the relations between Athens and Philip from 346 to 340, called 446—440 by an unfortunate misprint. If I may draw a conclusion from the few hints given here and in the notes, it appears that Dr. Abbott does not entirely accept Schäfer's view of Demosthenes' policy. Now and again he betrays a slight preference for Isocrates' ideal. It was no doubt a marvellous proof of power to quicken, as Demosthenes did, the half-dead patriotism of his fellow-citizens; to weld together in solid opposition to Philip whatever was left of unselfish and high-spirited feeling in Athens. But what has Dr. Abbott to say of the practical side of the question? 'How could the citizen troops on which Demosthenes relied hold their own in an age when standing armies were becoming more and more a necessity of successful warfare?' 'That Philip's power was based on violence . . . was not quite true. Many looked on him . . . even as the leader of Hellas.' Possibly, had not Demosthenes exalted Athens so high, Poliorcetes' exploits would never have been embroidered on her poplins. Her political power would doubtless have been humble: but at least she might have secured in the favour of Macedon a tolerable *modus vivendi*. But it was impossible that so ardent an admirer of Thucydides, so profound a believer in Athenian greatness, should bow his neck to the yoke of a foreigner.

The note on *de Pace* § 3 proposes τὰ προεμένα ἀνασώθησεται for τὰ π. σωθήσεται; but the constant use of σώω in this sense makes this improbable. In § 8 ἡν ἐκείνητο οὐσίαν φανεράν ἐξαργυρίσας . . . ἀπάγων οἰχεται, Cobet's ἀπῶν for ἀπάγων is rejected because 'he overlooks ἐξαργυρίσας.' This does not destroy the point of Cobet's query 'ἀπάγων quid?' *Αὐτὴν φ. οὐσίαν?* Probably ἀπάγων should be bracketed with Blass, as a gloss on ἐξαργυρίσας. But at § 24 τοὺς θρασύτας ὁτιοῦν οἰομένους ὑπομείναι δεῖν 'those who boldly think that we ought to expose ourselves at all risks,' the remark that this 'strains the sense of ὑπομείναι' is a mistake due to Cobet's statement 'est nova et inaudita θρασύτης si quis quodlibet ferre et pati putat oportere.' Unless the sense of ὑπομείναι is constantly strained by Thucydides and the orators, its proper meaning is 'to stand one's ground in the face of danger.' And which course involves more θρασύτης—φεύγειν or ὑπομείναι? Two examples taken from many cases are Thuc. vii. 42 οὐδὲ γὰρ ὑπομείναι ἂν σφῶς οὐδένα, Andoc. i. 20 ὁ πείσας ὑπομείναι καὶ μὴ οἰχεσθαι φεύγοντα.

In *Phil.* II. § 32, for οὐχ ἰδ' εἰς λοιδορίαν ἐμπειῶν ἐμαντῶ μὲν ἐξ ἴσου λόγον παρ' ὑμῖν ποιῶσα, the translation suggested is 'not that by indulging in abuse I may create talk for myself before you, i.e. display my powers in abuse.' But, while the editors rightly object to the explanation 'obtain a hearing' for λόγον ποιῶν, it seems simpler to take the words in the sense of 'to manufacture talk,' i.e. to talk for the sake of talking.

At § 14 of the *Chersonese* παρακαλεῖν should have been substituted for παρακαλέειν in the text, and at § 46 ἀνείκαστον for ἀνήκεστον is not Bekker's suggestion, but the reading of Σ . pr.

In *Phil.* III. § 11 the note on τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ, 'common in Herodotus, and occurs in the Tragedians,' should be extended to include Isocrates and other orators. In § 32 the passage κύριος δὲ το μέγιστον is omitted not only in Σ . pr. but also in L. pr., and Dräseke rejects this as an interpolation based on *F.* L. § 327. At § 48 Shilleto's explanation of ὥστε οὐδὲ

¹ May I be permitted to express my astonishment that the British Museum authorities have not acquired Blass' text, the first volume of which appeared in 1885, and also that they have only the first vol. of the same author's *Attische Beredsamkeit*? [We are informed by the authorities that these deficiencies have now been supplied. Ed.]

χρημάτων ἀνείσθαι is rightly rejected, and the proposed substitute, that *ἔσται οὐ* emphasizes a fact and not merely a result, states a view of this *οὐ* as old as Krüger and now, I believe, generally adopted. The only difficulty involved is that the indicative would be more natural. At § 5 the note on *ἀπὸς ἐστὶ γενέσθαι* refers without comment to the unsatisfactory note in Goodwin, to which attention has lately been drawn by Mr. Lendrum.

The book closes with an accurate and useful Index to both volumes. E. C. MARCHANT.

Livy. Book IV. Edited by H. M. STEPHENSON, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1890. 2s. 6d.

IN his preface Mr. Stephenson says 'This edition is intended, I suppose, mainly for use in schools,' and he very wisely observes 'that the notes in a school edition should be as brief as is consistent with the omission of no real difficulty' and 'that the main object of the notes should be to elucidate the meaning of the author.' These excellent maxims the editor has most carefully followed, and the result is a very good edition from which any student of Livy will be able to learn much that is valuable. No two people will perhaps ever have the same ideas as to what passages most require comment, but with a very few exceptions (to be noted subsequently) I have found all my difficulties explained, and there is hardly anything in the notes that I could regard as superfluous. The schoolmaster then—and it is for the schoolmaster chiefly, as Mr. Stephenson seems to hint, that all but the most elementary schoolbooks are edited—has been provided with a very useful edition; as for the average schoolboy or undergraduate, no note has perhaps ever yet been written or can be written which he will be certain to understand.

The notes in Mr. Stephenson's book are clearly printed, and are quite easy to find, in spite of the double system of reference by page and line as well as by chapter and section. It seems to me that the page and line reference is always useless and generally puzzling, while the chapter and section system allows the notes to be used with a different text, as is sometimes desirable.

The explanations given by the translations in the notes are admirable, but I think the English style is in one or two places a bad model for translation: e.g. liii. 8 'collared and dragged away' and from another point of view xlv. 4 'the pleasure of handselling a privilege.' Again on xxvii. 10 'neutiquam vulgatae laudis' is rendered by 'talent of no ordinary calibre' (the italics are mine as before), and this is a style of translation that boys should be discouraged from adopting.

The note on vii. 5, a difficult passage, is, I think, wrong. The passage runs thus: 'Ab senatu responsum est: iudicium populi rescindi ab senatu non posse, praeterquam quod nullo nec exemplo nec iure fieret, concordiae etiam ordinum causa.' Mr. Stephenson says 'praeterquam quod] quod is the conjunction: the subject to *fieret* must be supplied from *rescindi*. "Except where it was done without precedent or warrant of law, and that for the purpose of preserving harmony between the two orders." It is impossible that the absence of precedent could give a reason for action of any kind. I would suggest (still taking *quod* as the conjunction but taking *fieret* as representing *fiat* and not *fit* of *oratio recta*) 'a decision of the people could not be annulled by the senate, such a course would not only be unprecedented and illegal, but would endanger the good understanding between class and class,' lit. 'besides that it would be done after no precedent or law, also for the sake of the harmony of the orders (could not a decree of the people be rescinded).'

x. 6 *senatui superesse aliquid* &c. seems to need a note.

In the note on xi. 7 the construction '*coloni adscripti remanendo*' requires comment. It is probably an instance of the figure noticed in the first paragraph of the Appendix, but noticed there as if the usage was confined to pronouns. But cf. xxii. 34, 10 '*id consules ambos ad exercitum morando quacesse*.' On xv. 8 (the reference is wrongly given as xv. 7) it should be brought out more explicitly that it is only with negatives that '*magis quam*' and *μᾶλλον* *ἢ* are affected by *litotes*.

Ecce ante convecto xxii. 3 requires a note, and so do *propiorum locum* xxvii. 3, *ad quam publice consensuram* xxxv. 4 and *brevi reliquo vitae spatio* xli. 12.

On xxxiv. 6 it should have been observed that Livy's difficulty about the '*classis*' at Fidenae arose from a misunderstanding of the archaic use of the word.

In the heading to ch. xlv. (p. 55) 'uncle' is a slip for 'cousin.' ('*patrualem*' not '*patruum*' § 6).

On xlvii. 6 there is a note on *die octavo, quam*, but there should also be a note on vii. 3 *tertio mense, quam*, where the construction is the same.

In the note on lii. 5 the last word of 'was on the point of being lost' should be omitted or altered. As to what the editor wrote 'ea libera coniectura est.' Perhaps 'felt (more severely).'

On lvi. 13 I would suggest to Mr. Stephenson that 'per se potestatemque tribuniciam' means '(the patrician magistrates might be as unconstitutional as they liked) for any hindrance they would get from them (the speakers) and their power as tribunes (of the plebs).' This would be giving *tribunicia potestas* its ordinary meaning as in sec. 3 of the next chapter. Mr. Stephenson makes it refer to the consular tribunes.

The only errors in printing that I have noticed, besides those mentioned, are (i.) on p. xi. (Intr.) 'first consuls' should be 'first censors' (ii.) on p. 16 line 4 *ad tribunis* (iii.) on p. 81 (notes) the note on *nec se* ch. ii. § 5 is wrongly referred to § 6, and on p. 131 in the note on ch. ix. § 2 *commoditas* there is a misleading gap after the word 'infin.'

The text—like the notes, beautifully printed—is that of Luterbacher. Each chapter or portion is preceded by a clear summary and the dates B.C. are given throughout. There is a good Introduction; and some short notes on the text, an Appendix on Livy's grammar, and an Index which is perhaps full enough in a short and clearly printed book complete this most satisfactory volume.

M. T. TATHAM.

Sprechen Sie Attisch? Moderne Conversation in altgriechischer Umgangssprache, nach den besten attischen Autoren, von E. JOANNIDES, Dr. phil. Leipzig, 1889. Mk. 1.20.

THIS little book is interesting in itself, and also as an indication of the endeavour which teachers of Greek are everywhere making to present the language more and more as a living speech. The author points out how much better one appreciates the literature of a people if one brings to it a familiarity of tongue and ear with the language of conversation; and it is this side of Greek which is here presented in a great variety of brief conversations on the model of a *Sprachführer* for travellers. Aristophanes, Plato, and other Attic authors furnish most of the material; and gaps are filled from post-classical writers and modern Greek, all words not ancient being so marked. The vivacious tone of these conversations results from their nearness to every-day life. One speaker calls for beer, complains

of the waiter, promises a tip; a lady bids her lover speak with her mother; dancing, school-life, buying and selling, politics, the weather, even the mysteries of *Skat*—these and many other every-day topics are discussed in a lively fashion, for the most part in good Attic. Misprints of accents and breathings are rather frequent. For *συντάχθαι*, p. 27, read *συντάκται*; for *αὐτοκράτωρ*, p. 65, read *αὐτοκράτωρ*. The order is sometimes wrongly interpreted. Thus,

if any distinction is to be made (p. 16) between *σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ* and *τίς δ' εἶ σὺ*, it is the former which means, Who are you? and the latter which means, Who are you? But notwithstanding a few slips, the book will be found both amusing and suggestive. The preliminary remarks on Greek idioms, such as the scarcity of passives, various substitutes for the passive, the uses of *ταῖοις* and some common particles, are especially good. J. D. GOODELL.

NOTES.

PINDAR, *Nem.* IX. 16-19.

ἀνδροδάμαντ' Ἐριφύλαν, ὅρκιον ὥς ὅτε πιστόν,
δόντες Οἰκλείδῃ γυναῖκα, ἄνθοκομῶν Δαναῶν
ἔσσαν μέγιστοι· καὶ ποτ' ἐς
18 ἑπταπύλους Θήβας ἄγαγον στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν, αἰσιῶν
οὐ κατ' ὀνύχων ὁδοῦ.

This is a passage which has been dealt with more successfully by editors of the 17th and 18th centuries than by those of the 19th. The failure of the latter is instructive, because it raises the whole question of the right use of scholia and paraphrases.

As it stands, the passage is metrically defective. A dactyl is missing in line 18. And if *καὶ ποτ' ἐς* is brought from the preceding line to make this good, an epitritus (catalectic) is to be found for the place so vacated. This is what recent editors have done, and they supply the epitritus with the help of the vetus paraphrasta, who writes as follows: . . . καὶ οὕτω τῶν ἐξανθοκίμων Ἑλλήνων ἐγένοντο περιφανέστεροι οἱ περὶ Ἀδραστον. 41. καὶ ποτ' ἐς ἑπτ. Θ.] ἐντεῦθεν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰς Θήβας ποτὲ τὰς ἑπταπύλους στρατεύμα ἄγαγον οὐκ αἰσίοις οἰωνοῖς χρησάμενοι οἱ περὶ Ἀμφί-
ἀραν καὶ Ἀδραστον. Böckh suggested δὲ τότε καὶ ποτ' κ.τ.λ. Bergk in his latest ed. proposes ἔ. Δαναῶν τὰ πρῶτ' ἐγέντ' Ἀδραστίδα. But neither inference is a safe one. The paraphrast frequently throws in words like 'ἐντεῦθεν' or 'οἱ περὶ Ἀδραστον' to help out the sense: he had no suspicion when he wrote that his work would one day come to be used for the restoration of the text, and he is careless of verbal accuracy. Böckh's reading is accepted by several editors, but if they had found in the text a sentence beginning δὲ τότε καὶ ποτὲ they would probably have condemned one of the two formulae as a gloss upon the other. Kayser alone leaves *καὶ ποτ' ἐς* in the preceding line, where it stands in the codices and early editions. But he suggests ἑπτ. ἔθελον Θ. ἀγαγεῖν, which is weak and pointless.

Erasmus Schmid (1616) suggested ἑπτ. κριτὸν ἐς Θ. Beck (1792-5) prints ἑπτ. Θ. [λεκτῶν] ἄγαγον στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν. The latter suggestion seems to lead to as good a solution of the problem as can now be hoped for. Whence Beck obtained his reading I do not know. It may have been a conjecture of his own, and as it is a fairly obvious one its authorship is not worth discussing. Authority for it there would seem to be none. The Göttingen MSS. used by Beck have been examined since by other scholars, who make no mention of it. (Beck's edition was never completed. He published the text of the whole of Pindar, but his commentary covers only the Olympian odes.)

Acting upon this hint we may read—

Λεκτὸν ἐς ἑπτ. Θ.

καὶ ποτὲ

or, if Pindar like Hesiod admitted -ās—

Θήβας ἐς ἑπταπ. λεκτῶν ἄγαγον στρ. ἀνδρῶν.

There is some evidence for his having -ās in the acc. pl. masc.

The advantages of this solution are these:—

(a) *καὶ ποτὲ* remains where the texts place it.

(b) *καὶ ποτὲ* at the end of a line is quite in Pindar's manner. He has a habit of making a new departure in a catalectic epitritus, and *ποτὲ* often occurs as here. See *Ol.* iii. 13, τὰν ποτὲ, 29, *Pyth.* i. 16 τὸν ποτὲ, iv. 10, xii. 6, τὰν ποτὲ, etc.

(c) ἀνδρῶν receives an epithet, and is no longer a redundant appendage to στρατὸν.

That the paraphrast ignores the epithet proves nothing against it. He frequently does omit epithets like it. And the word may have fallen out long before his time. There would be four consecutive words (λεκτῶν—ἄγαγον—στρατὸν—ἀνδρῶν) of about the same length, and not very dissimilar.

The old editors give us something which is simple, and which Pindar might have written, though it has no traditional support; the recent editors something which has an illusory support in tradition—and no other merits whatsoever.

Nem. X. 61-66.

ἀπο Ταυγέτου πεδαιγῶζων ἴδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὺς
ἐν στελέχει
ἤμενος· κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίαν πάντων γένετ'
ὀξύτατον
ὄμμα. Λαίψηροῖς δὲ πόδεσσιν ἄφαρ
ἐξέκισθαν, καὶ μέγα ἔργον ἐμήσαντ' ὠκέως
65 καὶ πάθον δεινὸν παλῆμας Ἀφαρρητῖδαι Διός·
αὐτίκα γὰρ
ἦλθε ἡδὺς παῖς διώκων κ.τ.λ.

It would be a waste of time to retrace in detail the controversy which rages in the scholia on this passage. Aristarchus proposed ἤμενον, ἀκολούθως, we are told, τῇ ἐν τοῖς Κυπρίοις λεγομένη ἱστορίᾳ, but clearly because l. 66 seemed to imply that Polydeuces was not there when the murderous deed was done. The passage quoted from the Cypria contains these words:—

τάχα δ' εἶσιδε κύδιμος ἦρως
... ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἔσω δρυὺς ἄμφω κολῆς,
Κάστορά θ' ἱππόδαμον καὶ ἀεθλοφόρον Πολυδεῦκα.

And Apollodorus (*Bibl.* iii. 11, 4) gives the following version of the story: τὸν Ἰδαν ὁπὸ δουὶ ἐλθόντων καὶ τὸν Λυγέα. Λυγκεὺς δὲ ἰδὼν Κάστορα ἐμήνυσεν Ἰδᾶ κακέϊνος αὐτὸν κτείνει. Πολυδεῦκης δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.

The original story, which Pindar has told with his usual pregnant brevity, was this: Lynceus saw both of them in the tree from the crest of Ταῦγetus. Then, Idas and he came up stealthily, and, Lynceus being

able to see through wood and earth and anything, they 'spotted' the place where Castor was and drove a spear through (μέγα ἔργον ἐμήσαντ' ὥκτως—there is no hint of a combat, or that Castor had any chance of defending himself). Of course Polydeuces immediately came out and pursued them, as Pindar proceeds to relate.

The 'ἥμενος' of the best MSS. is an obvious blunder. But it is not to be regretted, for it has preserved for us the Doric acc. in -os (ἥμενος). Aristarchus is an immeasurably greater critic than Triclinius, but in this particular case modern editors would have done well to follow the latter (ἥμενος, codices Tricliniani, ed. Ald., ed. Romana—Beck, Heyne).

W. R. HARDIE.

THUC. II. 49.—διέζει γὰρ διὰ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος ἄνωθεν ἀρξάμενον τὸ κακόν, καὶ εἰ τις ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων περιγένοιτο, τῶν γε ἀκρωτηρίων ἀντίληψις αὐτοῦ ἐπεσήμεαι. For αὐτοῦ Herwerden accepts Rauchenstein's αὐτό, 'nämlich τὸ περιγενέσθαι' (Philol. 33, p. 570). Krüger and Classen make αὐτοῦ masc., constructing it with ἀκρωτηρίων. Stahl, Shilleto and Croiset make it neuter, i.e. τοῦ κακοῦ, constructing it with ἀντίληψις, i.e. 'its seizure of the extremities.' Thuc. says the plague first attacked the head, then the chest, then the stomach, at which stage most died. Of those who survived so far, the bowels were next attacked; at that stage many died. A few escaped, but even they were to a certain extent disfigured in the extremities, many escaping only with the loss of toes or fingers. That is, marks of the disease remained on the bodies of the convalescent. This is the meaning of τῶν γε ἀκρωτηρίων ἀντίληψις αὐτοῦ ἐπεσήμεαι. Thus ἀντίληψις should mean a settlement in the extremities, causing in some cases a permanent, in others a temporary disfigurement. The metaphor is a powerful one, and describes the grasp of an inevitable force; such a word might describe a cancer, or even the marks which remain after small-pox. Stahl objects to αὐτό for αὐτοῦ, and it will not do if it means τὸ περιγενέσθαι; but might it not stand in the sense of τὸ κακόν? Still, on the whole, I should prefer to bracket αὐτοῦ, believing it to be masc., and a gloss on ἀκρωτηρίων. Translate 'there remained behind (ἐπεσήμεαι, as evidence of the disease) an affection of the extremities.' Some editors translate ἀντίληψις as though it were ἡ ἀντίληψις.

THUC. II. 53.—ὅ τι δὲ ἦδη τε ἡδὺ καὶ πανταχόθεν τὸ ἐς αὐτὸ κερδαλέον τοῦτο καὶ καλὸν καὶ χρήσιμον κατέστη. Herwerden reads [τὸ] ἐς αὐτὸ κερδαλέον, Stahl τό <τ'> ἐς αὐτὸ, connecting πανταχόθεν with ἡδὺ because 'qui voluptatem sectantur, iis, cum quovis modo ea frui contendunt, non ea tantum placent quae omni modo, sed quae ullo modo eo conducunt. Atque hoc idem senserunt interpretes qui πανταχόθεν alicunde verterunt.' Steup objects to ἡδὺ πανταχόθεν, pleasant from every point of view, as unsuitable to the context; also, as Thuc. contrasts προταλαιπωρεῖν with ταχέας ἐπαυρέσεις, short-sighted sensuality with far-sighted prudence, he contends that ἐς αὐτὸ contradicts ἦδη, since it refers to the future, and it could not be used in contrast with προταλαιπωρεῖν. He therefore proposes καὶ τὸ ἐφ' αὐτὸ κερδαλέον, τοῦτο πανταχόθεν καὶ καλὸν κ.τ.λ., taking πανταχόθεν with καλὸν and χρ. I am unable to appreciate the difficulty Stahl finds in πανταχόθεν. What could Thuc. use? Perhaps ποθέν: but he has this only after εἰ, ὅ, ἄλλοθεν. Perhaps ἐκ τρόπου δτουοῦν: but, like ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου, this is rhetorical, not narrative; and moreover Thuc. only uses ὅτιοῦν &c. in conditional clauses. As πάντως is the opposite

to οὐδαμῶς, as the rhetorical ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου is the opposite of the rhetorical οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ, so πανταχόθεν is the opposite of οὐδαμόθεν. But πάντως means 'in any case,' as in 5, 41, ἐπεθύμουν τὸ Ἄργος πάντως φίλιον εἶχειν. Nor need ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου be collective, 'in all ways at once,' but may mean 'in any way possible at one time or another.' In 4, 72, ἐν γὰρ τῷ πρὸ τοῦ οὐδεμῆα βοήθειά πω οὐδαμόθεν ἐπῆλθεν, we have the opposite of πανταχόθεν ἐπῆλθεν, came first from one quarter, then from another, and so on all round. Why then should not πανταχόθεν = from any quarter at any particular moment, i.e. at any moment at which κερδαλέον τι presented itself, and from whatever source it could be obtained? Further, τὸ ἡδὺ became τὸ καλόν: what was τὸ κερδαλέον, which was confounded with τὸ χρήσιμον? Clearly money, however obtained. But money for itself is not χρήσιμον, and therefore Steup's τὸ ἐφ' αὐτὸ κερδαλέον is quite unsuitable. And just as their fault in seeking τὸ ἡδὺ was that they looked only to the present, so their fault in seeking τὸ κερδαλέον was that they grasped it by any method. Thus ἦδη answers to πανταχόθεν, as ἡδὺ to καλόν, κερδαλέον to χρήσιμον. Therefore Herwerden rightly brackets τὸ. Steup's objection that ἐς αὐτὸ could not be opposed to προταλαιπωρεῖν is groundless; for the whole passage shows that Thuc. alludes to base gain to be immediately spent on pleasure, in contrast with honest toil devoted to the future attainment of τὸ δόξαν καλόν what seemed good.

E. C. MARCHANT.

THUC. III. 68, 1.—οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι δικαστὰ νομίζοντες τὸ ἐπερώτημα σφίσις ὀρθῶς εἶναι, εἰ τι ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀγαθὸν πεπονῆσθαι, διότι τὸν τε ἄλλον χρόνον ἤξιον δῆθεν αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὰς παλαιὰς Πανασίων μετὰ τὸν Μῆδον σπονδὰς ἡσυχάζειν, καὶ ὅτε ὕστερον ἂ πρὸ τοῦ περιτευχίσθαι προείχοντο αὐτοῖς, κοινοὺς εἶναι κατ' ἐκεῖνα, ὡς οὐκ εἰδέξαντο, ἡγούμενοι τῇ αὐτῶν δικαίᾳ βουλήσει ἑσπορῶν ἦδη ὑπ' αὐτῶν κακῶς πεπονῆναι, κ.τ.λ.

Mr. Jowett's explanation of this passage, or I should say the explanation which he prefers of the five which he offers, is that 'ὅτε ὕστερον is dependent on ὡς οὐκ εἰδέξαντο, which answers to διότι ἤξιον, and gives the second reason for the conclusion of the Peloponnesians:—"since they requested as they said and the Plataeans did not receive their offers when afterwards they offered what they offered before the siege." Stahl omits & and reads ὡς δ' οὐκ εἰδέξαντο. Badham proposed ἐκεῖνας for ἐκεῖνα; and Herwerden, adopting this, reads δ...κατ' ἐκεῖνας, οὐκ εἰδέξαντο. But can it be that by any of these means we get what Thucydides wrote? I would suggest that ὡς οὐκ εἰδέξαντο is an adscript on τῇ αὐτῶν βουλήσει. It was the refusal by the Plataeans of the Lacedaemonian offers which justified the Lacedaemonians in feeling released from the obligation of the treaty; and this a commentator would feel it necessary to explain by the words ὡς οὐκ εἰδέξαντο. & has been introduced to make the untranslatable translate. Omit & and ὡς οὐκ εἰδέξαντο and sense and construction is plain.

H. F. FOX.

EUR. Electra, 608 sq.

σὺ δ', ἐκ βάθρων γὰρ πᾶς ἀνῆρσαι φίλοις
οὐδ' ἑλλέοιπας ἐλπιδ', ἰσθί μου κλύων κ.τ.λ.

'Ἑλλέοιπας' (ἐλλεοίπασσι), which does not seem to have been hitherto suggested, restores sense to this

passage. Translate—'Do thou, since thou art utterly ruined so far as friends are concerned (*φίλοι* dative of reference, Paley), and they (*φίλοι* supplied as subject from *φίλοις*) have left thee no hope, learn from me,' etc. The vulgate *ἐλλείπειας* would mean, 'thou hast left thy friends no hope,' a sense ill-suited to the passage. It is Orestes, not his friends, whose hopes have been wrecked, and who is told in the following passage that he must depend upon his own exertions alone—*ἐν χειρὶ τῇ σὴ πᾶν' ἔχεις*.

Weil's emendation *ἐλλελοῖσας* is open to the same objection as the vulgate, and a further one about the order of the words, as he joins *φίλοις* with what follows, instead of with what precedes.

The corruption of *ἐλλελοῖσας* into *ἐλλείπειας* would be facilitated by the proximity of *σύ* and the two verbs *ἀνῆρσαι* and *ἰσθί* in the second person singular.

For other examples of the elision of *i* of the third person plural perfect see *Tro.* 350; *ib.* 879; *Androm.* 377; *Ion* 1624; *Herc. Fur.* 539; *Cycl.* 679.

The following references to the same play in Liddell and Scott require correction:

904. *δυσάρεστος ἡμῶν καὶ φιλόσοφος πόλις.*

This passage is quoted as an instance of *δυσάρεστος* governing a dative and meaning 'ill-pleased with one.' Now there seems to be no authority for the dative except the gratuitous and unhappy conjecture of *ἡμῶν* in Paley's note, and *δυσάρεστος* bears its ordinary sense 'ill to please,' not 'ill pleased.' Translate—'Our townsfolk are hard to please (capitious) and censorious.'

978. *τῷ δ' αὖ πατρίαν διαμεθεῖς τιμωρίαν.*

On this *s.v.* *διαμεθίημι* the Lexicon says, '*to give up, τιλν τι*,' implying that the dative depends on *διαμεθεῖς*, with which in fact it has nothing to do.

A variant has been proposed for almost every word in the line, but according to all the recognised readings the dative depends on *δώσεις δίκην* supplied from the preceding line—'To him (*i.e.* Apollo) on the other hand thou must pay a penalty if thou surrenderest vengeance for thy father.' The construction suggested in the Lexicon might possibly hold good with the MS. reading *τῷ δαὶ πατρίαν διαμεθεῖς τιμωρίαν*; but that reading is clearly untenable.

CHARLES H. KEENE.

SEISACHTHEIA, the word associated with the drastic economical reform by which Solon corrected the mischief of exacerbated relations between the rich and the poor of Attica, was held by some ancients to be a characteristic euphemism invented in true Attic spirit by himself, to cloak what was its true but odious sense of *χρεῶν ἀποκοπή*. At present we find it universally translated, 'a shaking off of burdens.'

So Liddell and Scott:—'Strictly a shaking off of burdens (*σεῖω ἄχθος*); hence the name given to an ordinance of Solon by which all debts were lowered, —the disburdening ordinance. *Plut. Sol. xv. Diod. i. 79.*'

But *σεῖω* is not to shake off, but strictly to shake, to convulse. *Σεισίζων* is one of the epithets of Poseidon as Earth-shaker, as the causer of earthquakes. I am even disposed to believe that the title of Solon's great measure was suggested first by allu-

sion to this function of the god to whom, like his relative Peisistratus, he traced his ancestry.

Solon himself speaks of one result of his legislation having been to free the black earth from the fast infixed mortgage-pillars, the tearing up of which all over the land might seem the effect of a happier earthquake.

Seisachtheia then will more strictly stand for a general shaking up or displacement of burdens or charges; in this sense it answers much more truly to what was not a measure of simple repudiation but a complex scheme for the relief of the embarrassed, involving not alone reduction of debts by a lowered standard of money, but furthermore by exemption of the poorest class from direct taxation, by limitation of rate of interest and of extent of landed estates, and by emancipation of citizens reduced to slavery by debt. Androton quoted by Plutarch understands Seisachtheia in the more comprehensive sense.

W. WATKISS LLOYD.

CICERO, *Pro A. Cluentio*.

§ 167.—*Quid unquam Habitus in se admisit, ut hoc tantum ab eo facinus non abhorreere videretur? Quid autem magno opere Oppianicum metuebat, cum ille verbum omnino in hac ipsa causa facere nullum potuerit, huic autem accusatores, matre viva, deesse non possent? quod iam intellegitis. An ut de causa eius periculi nihil decederet, ad causam novum crimen accederet?*

§ 169.—*In quo primum illud quaero quae causa Habito fuerit cur interficere Oppianicum vellet. Inimicitias enim [inter ipsos] fuisse confiteor: sed homines inimicos suos morte affici volunt, aut quod metuunt, aut quod oderunt. 170. Quo tandem igitur Habitus metu a'ductus tantum in se facinus suscipere conatus est? quid erat quod iam Oppianicum poena affectum pro maleficiis, eiectione e civitate, quisquam timeret? quid metuebat? ne oppugnaretur a perditio? an ne accusaretur a condemnato?*

In the first of these passages Cicero is dealing with the charge against Cluentius of having poisoned one Balbutius by mistake in attempting to poison the younger Oppianicus; in the second with the charge of his having instigated Asellius to poison the elder Oppianicus. The answer is the same in both cases—there was no adequate motive to induce Cluentius to attempt such a crime. The similarity of the two clauses and the absurdity of supposing that Cicero could give as a reason for Cluentius having no fear of Oppianicus the younger, that he could not have opened his mouth in this case, '*cum ille verbum... potuerit*,' induced the late Professor Davies to make the ingenious suggestion (in *Hermathena*, vol. ii. p. 396) of transposing the whole clause '*quid autem... accederet*' to a position after *conatus est* in § 170. There the words refer to Oppianicus the elder, who could not open his mouth because he was dead in the eye of the law. Mr. W. Y. Fausset endeavours to answer this objection and to explain the words as they stand in three ways: (1) by the fact that at the time alluded to Oppianicus the younger was a minor; (2) by referring to the *infantia* (inability to speak) of Oppianicus the younger 'which Cic. derives in § 65, "*taetia pietate*"; (3) by Peterson's rendering, 'because he could not have the shadow of a case against him.' The third he justly dismisses as 'shirking the expression'; on the first he very fairly remarks that Cluentius might have wished to guard against future contingencies; and adopts the

second, which is that of Manutius, as 'quite the most satisfactory.' But surely it must strike every one in reading the speech how tenderly Cicero deals throughout with the younger Oppianicus. All his vehemence is expended in denouncing the crimes of the elder Oppianicus and of Sassa, who, he says, egged on the younger Oppianicus to take up this accusation—§ 179 *ut hunc Oppianicum aliud agentem... ad hanc accusationem detraheret*. Even in § 65 the passage quoted by Mr. Fausset, there is no derision of his inability to speak, and the very next words join him with Accius his counsel, 'audete negare.' Again in § 189 we have 'Quaero ex te Oppianice?' So Professor Davies' objection is still unanswered, and indeed Mr. Fausset in his critical note seems to admit this, suggesting two recensions (by Cicero's own hand). This is practically to give the passage up as hopeless. But the suggested transposition is also unsatisfactory. The argument in § 170 is complete and forcible as it stands. Each horn of the dilemma is fully treated. Cluentius could not have wished for the death of Oppianicus the elder from fear or from hatred; not from fear because Oppianicus was an outcast overwhelmed by the consequences of his crimes and could not accuse him, not from hatred because his life, shunned as he was and hated by all, was a far worse punishment than death. The insertion of the words from § 167 would weaken this and introduce intolerable tautology. More than this, I believe the first passage gives a perfect sense as it stands without the alteration of a letter. 'What crime did Habitus ever commit that would make such a fearful deed as this seem compatible with his character? Why should Oppianicus the younger be such an especial object of terror to him, when he (Oppianicus) need not open his lips in this trial, and yet accusers of my client (his) could never fail to be found while Sassa lived? as you will soon see. Should he have allowed a fresh charge (the poisoning of the younger Oppianicus) to be added to the case against him without a whit of the danger already existing (eius) being removed from the case?' The argument is quite clear. Were Oppianicus the younger the only one to accuse Cluentius there would have been a motive for poisoning him, and so silencing him for ever. But Sassa would have secured others to prosecute, and poisoning him would have been incurring a fresh risk without any advantage. The difficulty was caused by the ambiguity of the negative. Had Cicero given *lacere* instead of *verbum facere nullum* no one would have questioned my rendering: § 185 affords two examples, if any are needed, where the expressions are convertible. Indeed for 'inability to speak', *verbum f. ullum non potuerit* (or *nequiverit*) might seem more natural. We have the opposite in Cic. *ad Att.* I. xvi. 2 *nullis illum iudiciis effugere*, and Liv. xxi. 19, 5 *quis aciem censeret aut ob nulla quenquam merita in amicitiam recipi*. In Greek too, οὐδὲν προτιμᾷ σου (Ar. *Plut.* 883) might mean, 'there is nothing I prefer to you,' 'you are οὐδένος δεύτερος, instead of 'I think you worse than nothing,' 'beneath everything.' The same ambiguity lies at the root of the well-known fallacy 'Half a loaf is better than nothing, nothing is better than Heaven, therefore etc.'

In the last clause 'ut...nihil' must surely denote result not purpose. Why should we have expected *sua* for *eius* as Mr. Fausset says? *Eius* agrees with periculi, 'the danger of the former prosecution' (for poisoning Oppianicus the elder). *Accederet* may be an instance of the use of the imperf. subj. illustrated on Verg. *Aen.* viii. 643 'at tu dictis Albane maneres', but the parallelism of the words 'de causa decederet', 'ad causam accederet' makes for taking *ut* with both verbs, as Mr. Fausset suggests. Still 'ut...

nihil' must denote consequence, and no plea of concinnity would sanction its use for 'ne...quidquam,' which to my mind would give a far inferior sense.

P. SANDFORD.

* *

PERS. S. i. 78. *Aerumnis cor luctificabile fulla*.—The expression of Pacuvius here ridiculed was probably not so absurd as would appear from Conington's translation 'whose dolorific heart is stayed on tribulation,' or Gifford's 'propped with dolorific teen.' In Plaut. *Pseud.* 776 (III. i. 6) the boy had just complained that the gods 'multas aerumnas danunt,' and proceeds 'parvis magnisque ministeriis praefulcior.' Again in Plaut. *Pers.* 12, Sagaristio says '[erus] haud quit...quin me suis negotiis praefulciat.' No twisting of the notion of 'propping' can give a fair meaning in either of these passages. 'Press,' 'overwhelm,' or 'crowd' as an American might say, must surely be the idea involved. 'I am overburdened with duties great and small,' and 'my master can't stop overwhelming me with his business' are certainly sense. Professor Postgate in App. B to his Selections from Propertius excellently defends the meaning 'press' for *fulcire* in Prop. I. viii. 7 *pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinis*. He would connect the word with *farciare*, φαρσσω &c. [and the cognate *fregens* might support the American use of 'crowd' for 'press' or 'stuff'], but he translates the passage from Persius (why does he add in brackets: 'or Nero?') 'stuffed with griefs.' The difference is not great, but had that been the meaning Pacuvius might easily have written *farcta* as Plaut. *Epid.* III. iv. 19 *quo centones farcias* 'to cram your inventions down his throat' and in the passage he quotes from Appuleius *laciniis offulto vulnere* the bandage is surely drawn tight round the wound, not stuffed into it. So 'with her woesome (luctificabile is ridiculed by Pers.) heart o'erwhelmed (bowed down) with cares' is probably all that Pacuvius or Persius meant, though one is loath to part with the ingenious grotesqueness of the renderings of Conington and Gifford.

P. SANDFORD.

* *

JUV. S. ii. 78. *Cretice, perluces*. Under the word *perluceo* (*pell.*) a strange mistake is found in our principal Latin-English dictionaries. Lewis and Short (1880 or 1886), Smith (1881), White and Riddle, all translate this passage from Juv., 'you wear a transparent Cretan garment'! Of course *Cretice*, as in line 67 and S. viii. 38 is an address to Metellus as a type of the nobility. Equally of course the compilers of the dictionaries did not hit on such a blunder independently:

dedit hanc contagio labem
Et dabit in plures—

unless the *Classical Review* will stamp out the infection. But how did it originate? It seems that when Riddle's translation of Scheller (1835) gave the quotation, *cretice pelluces* (*sic*), some one misled by the small *c* and not objecting to a *cretic* in Juv., supposed the word was an adverb. No doubt a confused remembrance of the *Coa vestis* and the proximity of the islands gave plausibility to the error in the minds of those who followed him, though I can find no evidence that *multicia* ever were brought from Crete. Still it speaks ill for English lexicography that such a mistranslation should be transcribed from edition to edition, and from dictionary to dictionary, and it makes us the more regret that Professor Nettleship's great design should have resulted only in 'contribu-

tions,' valuable as those contributions are. There are many minor slips in Lewis and Short that Professor Nettleship must have noticed, which it is to be hoped will be corrected when a second edition of the book is issued.

P. SANDFORD.

HORACE, *Carm.* IV. 2, 49:

'io' que, dum procedit, 'io triumphe'
non semel dicemus.

This conjecture of Mr. Gow's for *teque* (p. 155 of the April number) has a special interest for me, as I had pencilled it in my own margin some while ago. I do not even now feel sure that it is right, for although Ovid often appends *que* in this way to a quoted word, there is no similar instance in Horace; and moreover Meineke's *atque* may well be the true reading. But my purpose in writing is to present Mr. Gow with a parallel passage which seems to tell strongly in his favour: Ovid *Trist.* IV. 2, 51 sq. 'tempora Phoebea lauro cingentur "io" que | miles, "io" magna voce "triumphe" canet.' This has all the air of a copy from the above text, for Ovid is here in a very imitative mood: the pentameter is taken word for word from Tib. II. 5, 118, and his next distich, 'ipse sono plausuque simul fremittique calentes | quadriungos cernes saepe resistere equos,' comes from Prop. III. 4, 14, 'ad ulgi plausus saepe resistere equos.'

Mr. Gow's certain emendation *cerebrigue* in *Serm.* II. 3, 208, was forestalled by Horkel, a critic who in a short life did more for the text of Horace than any man since Bentley, though the editors, with the significant exception of Meineke, seldom deign even to record his corrections.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

DARES PHRYGIUS.—It may interest some future editor of this writer to know that there is a manuscript of his *Narratio* in the Library of Gray's Inn. The collection of MSS. preserved there is a valuable one, though small, and was catalogued in 1869 by the late Mr. A. J. Horwood. The work of Dares comes second in the volume numbered 7 in Horwood's list, which is a bound volume of some twelve miscellaneous pieces, beginning with the *Epistolae* of Peter of Blois, and ending with a fragment of Trogus Pompeius. The handwriting is judged to be of the 13th century.

The celebrity of Dares in mediæval times is sufficiently attested by a single passage in Chaucer's *House of Fame*, where he is placed next after Homer, and side by side with Livy. Ill-deserved as this celebrity was, it can easily be accounted for, if we remember the way in which western Europeans loved to trace their descent from Troy. In France or England, accordingly, this pretended work of the Trojan priest of Hephæstus came to be regarded as the earliest authority on their own *origines*. It agrees with this that in the present MS. the *Narratio* is followed on the same page, and without any other break than a rubricated heading, by a short *Vera historia de morte Arthuri*.

Meister, in his edition of Dares for the Teubner series (1873), points out the wide divergencies of the MSS. both in wording and spelling. This may be due in part to the wretched style of the author himself, which, as Collilleux says, 'sent la barbarie de l'extrême décadence.' The Gray's Inn MS. has its full share of such variations. It has at the end the list of chieftains slain on each side, which Meister (p. viii.) says is wanting in many copies. Several of the names I cannot identify with any of those given by Meister from a MS. of the tenth century, or with those extracted by Koerting from Benoît de Sainte-More, at p. 97 of his *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Troja-Sage* (1874).

J. H. LUTTON.

NO. XXXIV. VOL. IV.

OMENTUM.—The conclusions arrived at by Mr. Still in his paper (p. 157 of this volume) on the meaning and use of this word will without doubt be generally accepted. The derivation which he prefers is however open to objection. In the first place the correct equivalent of *pm* in Latin is, not a single *m* with compensatory lengthening, but *mm*, e.g. *summus* = sup-mo-s. This indeed is not insuperable as, if we admitted *rumentum* from $\sqrt{\text{rup}}$, *amentum* from $\sqrt{\text{ap}}$, and *imentum* from $\sqrt{\text{op}}$, we might reverse the rule, and explain *summus* like *Iuppiter*. The second objection is more serious. The termination *mp-t-o-* is very frequent both in Latin and in Greek,¹ and its function is fairly clear. It is a secondary participial formation, prevailing with passive force, and consequently attaches regularly to verbal roots. From Greek *καταρύματα* and *δέρματα* are good examples. In Latin, I think, although it is very widespread, it occurs with verbal roots only, *alimenta*, *armenta*, *caementa*, *cognomentum*, *pigmentum*, *sarmenta*, *tormentum*, and from secondary verbal stems *armamenta*, *fundamenta*, *vestimentum* being a few of the commonest: *op* not being a verbal root, the derivation from it is therefore without precedent.

Mr. Still does not refer to the most modern etymology—that of Windisch,² who refers it to a root *uep*, Skt. *vapā*. This is also open to objection, and is marked as doubtful by Stolz.³

The other derivation (Vanicek's), of which Mr. Still approves, is really preferable, although Byrne's principles may not be considered as decisive proof. The root found in *induo* has really a more widespread existence than is generally recognized. In the modern orthography its forms are *eu*, *ou*, *u*: from the first form come *induo*, *exuo*, through *-ouō* from *-euō*; from the second (probably) Umbrian *anovihimū* (*Tab. Ig.* VI. B. 49); from the third *exuviae*. This however does not exhaust the root; *imentum* appears to come from the first stage (cf. *caementum*) as instances of strong Ablaut with this suffix seem not to occur. The primary meaning of the root seems to be 'draw,' and hence it provides a satisfactory derivation for *rūmen*⁴, i.e. *re-u-mēn*, cf. Serv. *Verg. Ecl.* 6. 54, who defines it⁵ as *eminens gutturis pars per quam demissus cibus a certis reuocatur animalibus*. Again, to this root may be referred Latin *auco* and Skt. *av*.⁶ The Latin verb is causative and so the root-form would be *ou* (like *monco*, *φορτω*), **ouco* would become *auco* by Thurneysen's rule. The development of sense is of course very simple (cf. *attractive*), and has also been followed by Skt.

Finally I would remark that Mr. Still's reference of *δύη* to this root is, so far as I know, new. The accepted derivation⁷ is from $\sqrt{\text{sin}}$, Lat. *suo*, which I think is distinctly inferior. The only meaning of the word which it suits is that of marriage (*γᾱήν*, *δυναίος*, etc.) and even for these the sense of 'veiling' given by our root accords much better with all that we know about the Indo-European view of the matter.

H. D. DARRISHIRE.

¹ Brgm. *Grds.*, II. § 82.

² *Lit. Centralbl.* 1888, col. 668.

³ Müller's *Handb.* II². p. 257.

⁴ Other etymologies: (a) $\sqrt{\text{aru}}$ Curt. *Grds.* 353-4; (b) $\sqrt{\text{rug}}$, Kluge, *Etym. Wörl.* ed. 4, p. 274b. It might also be possible to establish a connection with Greek *ἐρύω*.

⁵ There is a variant *rūma*.

⁶ Generally equated with the supposed Greek *εω*. This I have endeavoured to prove non-existent (*Trans. Camb. Phil. Soc.* III. 94).

⁷ This originated, I think, with Pott.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

DR. DÖRPFELD ON THE GREEK THEATRE.

It sometimes happens that a reviewer—if he be himself a man of original views—makes of his *critique* not so much a review as a statement of his own independent opinion. Such is the case with Dr. Dörpfeld's review of Mr. Haigh's 'Attic Theatre.' It is no purpose of ours to review a review, but it happens that Dr. Dörpfeld in his article in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for April 12 not merely criticizes Mr. Haigh's work but gives us for the first time a full summary of his own opinions—opinions of which scraps have leaked out here and there, and which are known to be startling and original. To those readers, both classical and general, who have studied Mr. Haigh's book (reviewed by Dr. Verrall in the last—May—number of this *Journal*) and who may not have seen the *Wochenschrift*, I have thought an account of Dr. Dörpfeld's position, so far as he states, at present, might be acceptable.

And first, Dr. Dörpfeld gives us good news. His monograph on the Attic theatre, for which archaeologists have so long eagerly looked forward, he now definitely promises shall appear next winter. It is to be entitled 'The Theatre of Dionysos at Athens: Studies in the History of the Ancient Theatre,' and is to be written in conjunction with Dr. Emil Reisch. It will form one of the supplementary volumes of the *Jahrbuch* of the German Archaeological Institute. So great however is the interest of some of the questions connected with the Greek theatre, both to professionals and laymen, that Dr. Dörpfeld decides to give in the *Wochenschrift* this preliminary summary. It is only a man with a wealth of material at hand who, careless of the economy of his own fame, thus anticipates the interest of a forthcoming book.

The two main points as to which dispute rages are:

(1) Is the theatre at Athens as it at present stands a work in the main of the fifth or fourth century B.C.? Mr. Haigh, A. Müller, and the orthodox school generally say the fifth, Dr. Dörpfeld says the fourth.

(2) Did the chorus and the actors in a Greek—as distinguished from a Roman—theatre act on the same level with each other, or were the actors raised on a stage above the heads of the chorus? The orthodox

party say the actors were raised, Dr. Dörpfeld maintains that down to Roman date chorus and actors stood on the same level.

For the present let us confine our attention to the second problem, reserving Dr. Dörpfeld's views as to the first question for a future occasion. It is on the discussion of the second that the interests of the literary scholar are mainly involved.

The arguments then for his position, that the actors and chorus were in Greek days on one and the same level, Dr. Dörpfeld states as follows:

1. According to Vitruvius there was in the Greek theatre a *logeion* of from ten to twelve feet high—and as a matter of fact there have been discovered in several Greek theatres recently excavated façades of the stage structure of this height. On technical and artistic grounds, upon which he cannot for the moment enter, it appears to Dr. Dörpfeld *a priori* unlikely that the actors should have played at such a height from the ground, and so far removed from the chorus. Mr. Haigh on the other hand answers that in the time of Vitruvius a podium of from ten to twelve feet was obviously not considered too high. He concedes indeed thus much, that such a podium would be too high for the dramas of the great tragedians and comedians, and hence proceeds to assume that in the fifth century B.C. there was a lower *logeion* about six to seven feet high. In the fourth century he thinks this was raised, *i.e.* to from ten to twelve feet, and in Roman days it was lowered again to five feet. This theory as to these successive ups and downs of the Greek stage is pure assumption, and rests on no distinct ancient statement. It is much simpler to suppose that the statement of Vitruvius rests on a misunderstanding. His description of the structure of a Greek theatre is perfectly correct, for the theatres excavated at Epidauros, Athens, Oropos, Assos, etc., agree in all essentials with that description. The front structure of the stage near to the orchestra he rightly calls the *proskenion*, a name for which we have at Oropos epigraphic evidence. His error is simply this, that he believes this front structure of from ten to twelve feet high, *i.e.* the *proskenion*, to be one and the same with the five foot high *logeion* of the Roman theatre, and hence believes that the actors ordinarily acted on the *proskenion*. But the *proskenion* of the Greek theatre is

simply the decorative wall in front of the stage structure, and *in front of which* the acting went on. It has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the Roman logeion, *on* which the play was acted. It was only under exceptional circumstances that actors who had to appear on the roof of a house or at some elevated point stood *on* the proskenion. The height of the proskenion, *i.e.* from ten to twelve feet, just corresponds with the height of the ordinary Greek house.

2. The proskenion of the Greek theatre, as given by Vitruvius, and as it appears in the theatres that have been excavated, is so narrow that it would be impossible for the actors to appear together on it, and at the same time to leave room for decorative apparatus. The actors with their masks would, when in excited action, have run great risk of toppling over from their high narrow podium. Mr. Haigh urges against this that the inconsiderable breadth was a necessary consequence of the great height; had the breadth been greater, he urges, the spectators on the lowest row of seats would only have been able to see the upper half of the bodies of the actors. Dr. Dörpfeld appositely replies that the Greeks were a practical people, and would have been little likely to make bad worse by adding the inconvenience of narrow space to the awkwardness of great height. Rather they would have decreased the height in order to increase the breadth. For where was the necessity to have the podium a height of from ten to twelve feet?

3. In the ancient Greek theatre we have no evidence of direct communication between the roof of the proskenion (the supposed logeion) and the orchestra. Even Vitruvius makes no mention of a staircase to lead from the orchestra to the proskenion. Mr. Haigh meets this difficulty by supposing that there may have been a wooden structure of which naturally there would now be no extant trace. But in the first place why should the staircase alone be wood when all the rest of the structure was stone? In the second, such a staircase would have had a disastrous effect in concealing the proskenion, the architecture of which is advisedly decorative. Thirdly, in all theatres where a proskenion has been discovered, there is in the middle of it a door leading into the interior of the building. Fourth, this staircase, if it existed, must, to reach the given height of ten to twelve feet, have been of considerable length, *i.e.* about fifteen feet, and this would have greatly encroached

on the space of the circular orchestra. From the present condition of the Greek theatres so far discovered it may safely be asserted that there was no direct communication between the orchestra and the roof of the proskenion.

Mr. Haigh in this connection points out that in lower Italy vases of the third century B.C. the actors are represented standing on a scaffolding, and up to this leads a staircase or ladder. Surely it is, to say the least, noticeable that these vases are all of lower Italy origin, and that among the thousands of vases made in Greece there is not a single one in which a logeion is represented. Further, it must not be overlooked that on none of these vases is a chorus represented: in such plays as are depicted there was no chorus. These vases can then in no way be a criterion by which the question can be answered, 'Did the players and the chorus act together on the orchestra, or was there a separate stage for the players with a staircase leading up to it?' Nor can the question be answered by reference to statements made by lexicographers or grammarians; even Mr. Haigh concedes so much. Only such notices as are taken from the great tragedians and comedians themselves and such as occur in other writers of the fifth and sixth century B.C. can fairly be used.

But, be it observed, no such author ever speaks of a logeion in the theatre, or says that actors and chorus stood on a different level. The very word logeion does not occur in their writing—it is met with first in works of Roman date. The orchestra, the thymele, the skene are frequently mentioned as parts of the theatre—the speaking-place (the logeion) never. Mr. Haigh thinks otherwise; following for the most part A. Müller, he cites several passages from which the existence of a raised stage side by side with the orchestra in the theatre of the fifth century B.C. can, he thinks, be inferred. First he calls attention to the expressions *ἀναβαίνειν* and *καταβαίνειν* (which he would translate *go up* and *go down*), and which are said to be only explicable on the supposition that the actors stood on a raised stage. But this use of the word is older than the fifth century B.C. and did not first come into existence when theatres were built. Before that the word *ἀναβαίνειν* had been employed for any orator who mounted some elevated place to be the better seen and heard. To stand on an elevation was indeed a necessity so long as the spectators stood or sat on level ground. At the festival of Dionysos, as well as on other occasions, the actor when

declaiming would at first (when there was no regular arrangement of seats tier above tier) mount on the steps, or rather on the raised platform (*θυμέλη*) of the sacrificial altar which stood in the orchestra. Even later, when there were regular structures for the spectators' seats and for the stage, he might on the occasion of long speeches or whenever it seemed appropriate mount on the thymele. As a rule however, he would stand in that portion of the orchestra which lay between the thymele and the skene. These expressions therefore (*i.e.* *ἀναβαίνειν* and *καταβαίνειν*) prove nothing as to the condition of the theatre structure in the fifth century B.C.

Next come two places from the *Wasps* and *Birds* of Aristophanes, from which the conclusion is directly drawn that the actors stood higher than the chorus. In the one place (*Wasps* 1514), according to Dr. Dörpfeld, 'ἀρὰ καταβατέον γ' ἐπ' αὐτούς' means simply, taking it in conjunction with the context, not I must go down against them, but simply I must have a fight with them, 'descend into the arena with them,' as we might say (*καταβαίνειν εἰς ἀγῶνα* = in certamen descendere), that Philokleon was standing in the orchestra before is clear from the fact that just that very moment he had been leading the dance. It would have been quite impossible to dance about wearing a mask on the high narrow logeion. In the second place (*Birds* 175-178) the injunction 'look down' (*βλέπον κάτω*) is given, because the scene represented a path rising up and leading to a grotto. Mr. Haigh further calls attention to a passage in Plato (*Symp.* 194) in which mention is made of the *βαίνειν* (mounting up) of the actors ἐπὶ τὸν ὀκρίβαντα. The *okribas* was an elevation in the middle of the circular Odeion, and probably resembled the thymele in the orchestra of the theatre. On this *okribas* the actors mounted in the proagon which took place in the Odeion. If *ὀκρίβας* were, as is pretended, the usual name for the supposed logeion of the Greek theatre, why is it so seldom employed, and why was it not later adhered to?

Such are the principal arguments which Mr. Haigh gleans from ancient writers. In addition however he states two general considerations which he considers fatal to the theory that the actors played on the orchestra. First he holds it to be scarcely credible that a podium (*i.e.* the proskenion), which was originally invented as a *background*, should later develop in the Roman theatre to a raised platform for the actors.

No one maintains it ever did. Mr. Haigh has here clearly failed to understand the new theory explicitly, though it is stated by Dr. Kawerau in Baumeister's *Denkmäler* (*sub. voc.* Theatergebäude.)

The proskenion of the Greek theatre with its decorative pillars never *did* become the logeion of the Roman theatre, but always remained even there as a background *in front of which* the actors played. The Roman logeion, it is far more likely, arose from the fact that the old circular orchestra was divided into *two* portions, the logeion and at a lower elevation the konistra (arena). When the chorus had fallen into disuse the whole orchestra was no longer needed for dramatic representations, but only the portion where the actors were accustomed to stand, *i.e.* the part between the thymele and the proskenion. The elevation of the lower half, *i.e.* the portion furthest from the proskenion, was lowered and used in fact for further seats, and also as a barrier in the case of gladiatorial contests. In accordance with this we find in many theatres that have been altered in Roman times that the lowest circular row of seats is on a level with the logeion, *e.g.* at Assos, Pergamos, Aizani and Aspendos. If in these theatres we imagine the semi-circular konistra completely filled up to the level of the lowest row of seats, we then obtain the only original stageless Greek theatre. In accordance with their joint origin, both portions of the old orchestra, *i.e.* the konistra as well as the logeion, have a right to continue to bear the name of orchestra, and in point of fact the word orchestra is used of both. Dr. Dörpfeld refers to his forthcoming book for the full demonstration of the steps of this development, contenting himself with the interesting statement that the development of the Roman from the Greek theatre, at first sight hard to explain, on the new assumption becomes when rightly understood the strongest argument for its support.

In the second place Mr. Haigh says he cannot understand how the Greeks for the space of 200 years could go on arranging their chorus in such a fashion that it must conceal the actors behind it. But the chorus in no way *did* conceal the actors. It was usually divided into two semi-choruses which planted themselves, not straight in front of the spectators but at either side; it was at most but a small body compared to the great space of the orchestra over which it moved. Its simple dress distinguished its members quite clearly from the actors, who by their costume and by the

cothurnus were easily recognizable, and further it must not be forgotten that even the lowest row of seats was somewhat higher than the level of the orchestra, and that the higher the spectator sat the more he could look down and get a bird's-eye view of the performance. Although in our modern theatres a great portion of the audience is seated lower than the stage, yet no scruple is felt in putting many accessory persons together on the stage, who must necessarily obscure the view of the principal actors from a considerable portion of the spectators.

We have given a statement—for the most part a close translation—of Dr. Dörpfeld's view; no criticism is attempted; before the appearance of his book such criticism would be obviously premature. We have only desired that a view so novel and so suggestive should be made widely known to the English public to whom the orthodox view is already familiar through many manuals.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Verrall arguing from purely literary considerations has arrived (*Classical Review*, May 1890, p. 225) at the conclusion that 'nothing but overwhelming evidence (and there is none) should make us believe that the stage'—i.e. of the time of Aeschylus—'was "Vitruvian."'

JANE E. HARRISON.

DR. DÖRPFELD'S THEORY ABOUT THE LOGEION IN GREEK THEATRES.

It is well known that for some years past Dr. Dörpfeld, the distinguished archaeologist, has been propounding views of a novel and revolutionary character on the subject of Greek dramatic performances. In defiance of the ancient authorities he denies the existence of a stage for the actors, and maintains that actors and chorus performed together in the orchestra, and stood upon the same level. The new theory, as expounded by Kawerau in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, and further explained in some brief communications from Dr. Dörpfeld to myself, I discussed at length, and endeavoured to refute, in *The Attic Theatre* (pp. 142—146). Dr. Dörpfeld, in a review of my book, published in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for April 12th, has taken the occasion to give a more precise and detailed exposition of his views than had yet appeared, and at the same time answers the objections which I brought against them. A summary of his article by Miss Harrison

will be found in the present number of the *Classical Review*. I propose in the following pages to examine his arguments and criticisms in detail.

English readers have been inclined to suspend their judgment on the question, until Dr. Dörpfeld should have stated more definitely the exact facts upon which he relied. They naturally imagined that views of such a startling character must be grounded on some very decisive discovery made in the course of the recent excavations. On reading his article they will, I think, be surprised to find that the archaeological discoveries of the last few years, so far from supporting his theory, form in fact one of the principal obstacles to its acceptance, and tend strongly to confirm the testimony of the ancient writers.

The most noticeable point in Dr. Dörpfeld's article is the following. It appears now to be established beyond a doubt that, from the fourth century B.C. down to the latest period in which purely Greek theatres were constructed, the proscenium in a Greek theatre was substantially such as Vitruvius describes; that is to say, that it was a long and narrow structure, from ten to twelve feet in height, and about ten feet deep. This fact is proved by the recent excavations, and admitted by Dr. Dörpfeld. As far as the fifth century is concerned we are still left in the dark. The proscenium of the fifth century were made of wood, and of course no traces of them remain. But we may now take it for granted, on Dr. Dörpfeld's authority, that from the fourth century onwards the proscenium was about twelve feet high.

Dr. Dörpfeld maintains that this proscenium was intended, not as a stage, but as a background; that the actors performed in the orchestra, *in front of* the proscenium, but never *upon* it, unless they were to be represented as standing on a palace roof or other eminence. His reasons for his strange opinion are merely these: (1) that a stage only ten feet deep would have been too narrow for the actors, (2) that in the existing remains of Greek proscenium there are no traces of any connexion between the orchestra and the stage.

Before proceeding to examine his arguments I will first state briefly my own views on the subject, as already expressed in *The Attic Theatre* (p. 158). It appears to me to admit of no doubt that throughout the whole history of the Greek drama the actors performed upon a stage of some kind or another, so as to be raised above the level of

the chorus. It is now also established that from the fourth century onwards this stage was about twelve feet high and ten feet deep. As to the fifth century we have no positive information; but my own opinion is that the stage was then considerably lower, and possibly also deeper, than in the succeeding period.

This last suggestion of mine is called an 'arbitrary' one by Dr. Dörpfeld. But the grounds upon which it is based appear to me to be almost conclusive. What are the facts of the case? We know that until the latter part of the sixth century the spokesman who delivered the speeches between the choral odes used to mount upon a small erection called a 'table.' The name 'table' shows that the erection cannot have been of any great height, certainly not as high as the human figure. We know that in the fourth century this 'table' had developed into a stage about twelve feet high. For the intervening period we have no direct evidence. But in the first place it would be absurd to suppose that, when the table was replaced by a stage, the height of the stage was fixed immediately, and once for all, at twelve feet. In the second place we know that in the dramatic performances of the fifth century there was a close and intimate connexion between the actors and the chorus; while in the fourth century the chorus disappeared altogether from comedy, and was reduced in tragedy to the function of merely singing interludes. In the fifth century therefore it would be desirable for the occupants of stage and orchestra to be brought into close proximity to one another; in the fourth century such proximity would no longer be required. To what conclusions can these combined considerations lead, except that in the fifth century the stage was considerably lower, and nearer to the orchestra, than in the fourth?

In discussing these questions we should never forget that during the fifth century the Greek drama was passing through a period of growth and development. Both in outward features and inner spirit it was being subjected to continual alteration. It was not till the fourth century that it was reduced to a more or less stereotyped form; and it was in the fourth century likewise that the stage finally acquired that regulation height and depth which Vitruvius ascribes to it. The mistake which has hitherto been made has been to suppose that, if there was any stage at all in the fifth century, it must have been a stage of the exact Vitruvian type. Such a supposition

is not only needless, but altogether improbable; and if we keep this fact clearly in view, most of the difficulties hitherto felt in connexion with the subject will disappear.

To return once more to Dr. Dörpfeld's theory. Dr. Dörpfeld asserts that throughout the whole period during which Greek dramas continued to be performed in Greek theatres, that is to say, from the sixth century B.C. to about the second century A.D., there was no such thing as a stage for the actors; that the proscenium was meant to serve, not as a stage, but as a background. But Vitruvius, writing in the first century B.C., expressly tells us that the proscenium in a Greek theatre was intended for the actors to perform upon. How does Dr. Dörpfeld meet this difficulty? He denies that Vitruvius knew the real purpose for which, even in his own time, a Greek proscenium was constructed. While admitting that he is perfectly correct in his description of the height and depth of the proscenium, he asserts that he was mistaken in supposing it to have been intended for a stage. A moment's consideration will show the hopelessness of substantiating such a view. Vitruvius is a professional architect, writing about his own special subject. In the course of his travels he would have frequent opportunities of seeing dramas performed in Greek theatres. Moreover his remark about the use of the proscenium is introduced, not as a mere casual observation, but for the express purpose of explaining the difference in construction between a Greek and Roman stage. 'The reason,' he says (v. 7), 'of the extreme height and narrowness of the Greek stage is because, in Greek dramas, only the actors appear upon the stage, the chorus being in the orchestra. The Roman stage, on the other hand, is necessarily deeper, because it has to accommodate all the performers.' An utterance so precise and definite as this, and made by a man who had ample information on the subject, cannot be set aside merely from *a priori* considerations.

But even without the testimony of Vitruvius it would be impossible to doubt that the Greek actors appeared on the proscenium, and not in the orchestra. Pollux, Phrynichus, Hesychius, and Photius all tell us that the actors appeared upon an elevated stage. The three scholiasts on Aristoph. *Equit.* 149, though they differ in their view of the passage, are unanimous on this one point, that the actors appeared upon a stage, and not in the orchestra. These various writers derived their information from the

vast stores of learning accumulated by the Alexandrian grammarians. They did little more than compile and select from the mass of erudition handed down to them. If we adopted Dr. Dörpfeld's theory we should have to assume that, although on most occasions they were content to follow their Alexandrian authorities, yet by some curious fatality, whenever the relative position of actors and chorus had to be considered, they abandoned their usual guides, and introduced foolish and mistaken notions of their own. That there should have been such a determined consensus in error, on the part of writers widely removed from one another both by time and place, is an altogether incredible supposition.

Then again, how are we to account, on Dr. Dörpfeld's hypothesis, for the use of the term *λογεῖον* to denote the platform on the top of the proscenium? That the word was employed originally in reference to the Greek, and not the Romanised, proscenium, is proved by the language of Vitruvius, who calls the Roman stage merely 'pulpitum' (v. 6), but when he comes to speak of Greek theatres says 'ampliorem habent orchestram Graeci et scaenam recessiorem minoreque latitudine pulpitum, quod *λογεῖον* appellant' (v. 7). This being so, how could the top of the Greek proscenium have been called *λογεῖον*, or the 'speaking-place,' unless it had been the place for the actors? It would be impossible for it to have acquired the name merely from the rare and exceptional occasions on which the actors appeared on the roof of a house or other eminence. In the whole of the extant Greek tragedies and comedies there are not a dozen instances of such appearances.

There is also the question about the doors. Pollux, writing in the second century A.D., and writing exclusively about Greek theatres and theatrical affairs, tells us that in the back-scene of a Greek theatre there were three doors leading out upon the stage; and he proceeds to describe in detail the various purposes for which, in different Greek dramas, these doors were used. But in the existing Greek proscenia it is invariably found that there is only *one* door leading out upon the orchestra. It is true that in the projections at each end of the proscenium at Epidaurus there are doors leading out into the side-passages; but these doors are too far removed from the centre of the proscenium to have been used as a part of the back-scene. If then Dr. Dörpfeld's theory is correct, and the proscenium with its single door served as the background,

how are we to account for the minute and detailed description of the three doors in Pollux?

It would be easy to fill many pages in pointing out the difficulties and improbabilities of the new theory; but lack of space compels me to proceed at once to the consideration of Dr. Dörpfeld's other criticisms.

Dr. Dörpfeld objects that a stage only ten feet deep would have been too narrow to hold the scenery, and at the same time allow room for the actors. But the scenery in the Greek drama was of the simplest possible description, consisting merely of painted boards or curtains affixed to the wall at the back; and would therefore take up practically no room at all. He adds that the actors would be in danger of tumbling off such a narrow platform. In this contention I think few readers will be inclined to agree with him. The Greek actor had a task to perform much more difficult than that of keeping his foothold on the narrow stage. He had to acquire the art of moving gracefully and securely on the tall and clumsy oothurnus. After he had learnt to accomplish this feat, he might safely be trusted not to lose his head when he found himself on a platform only ten feet in depth.

The narrowness of the Greek stage will not appear surprising, if we divest our minds of modern associations. It was in no way the object of the Greek stage manager to produce, by means of well-arranged groups and elaborate scenery, the effects of depth and distance which we get in modern theatres and modern pictures. Such effects would have been altogether inconsistent with the simple character of early Greek art, which, as compared with that of modern times, was deficient in the qualities of depth and perspective. The spectacle presented by the Greek stage was rather that of a painted frieze or bas-relief: the statuesque figures of the actors and their attendants, arranged in line upon the narrow proscenium, with the long flat scene behind them, combined to form a tableau such as the Greeks were accustomed to see in various works of art. To produce a spectacle of this kind a narrow stage was not only adequate but essential.

Dr. Dörpfeld asks what reason there could have been for making the stage as high as ten or twelve feet. Two reasons may be suggested. In the first place, as the auditorium rose tier above tier to an immense height at the back, the increased elevation of the stage would bring the actors more on a level with the audience, and improve the

view. In the second place, when the chorus had lost all connexion with the action of the plays, and become an inconvenient excrescence, it would be an advantage, as Dr. Verrall points out in his recent article, to emphasize the separation between the actors and the chorus by raising the stage still further from the orchestra.

Another objection of Dr. Dörpfeld's to the received theory is that in the old Greek theatres there is no connexion between the top of the proscenium and the orchestra. But the connexion was supplied, when required, by flights of wooden steps, as explained by Pollux (iv. 137), and Athenaeus *περί μηχανημάτων* (p. 29 Wesch.). Dr. Dörpfeld appears to doubt their statements, and asks why the steps were made of wood, the rest of the proscenium being of stone. The objection does not apply to the fifth century, when both steps and proscenium were made of wood. It only applies to the tall stone proscenium of the fourth and succeeding centuries; and the reason why, in the later proscenium, the steps formed no permanent part of the structure, but could be removed at will, was simply this, that they were only required on very rare occasions. The use of the steps was to supply a means of communication between the chorus and the actors. Now in the fourth century the chorus had either disappeared altogether, or been reduced to the position of the band in a modern theatre. The only occasions when a connexion between orchestra and stage would be required was in the revivals of the plays of the great masters of tragedy. Revivals of Aeschylus, at this period, were exceedingly rare; and in Sophocles and Euripides it is altogether exceptional for the chorus to ascend the stage. Practically therefore, during and after the fourth century, a connexion between orchestra and stage by means of steps would only be necessary at the revivals of a very few plays of Sophocles and Euripides. Hence when the large stone proscenium of the fourth century came to be built, there was no reason whatsoever for making the steps a permanent part of the design. Dr. Dörpfeld further objects (1) that the steps would hardly have harmonized with the architectural ornamentation of the proscenium, (2) that they must have been placed in front of the central door leading out of the proscenium, (3) that they would have projected a long way into the orchestra. All these objections, which refer solely to the elaborate and lofty proscenium of the later period, fall to the ground at once, when we

remember that the steps were not permanently affixed, but as a matter of fact were only used on very exceptional occasions.

A further proof of the use of temporary steps in front of the proscenium in Greek theatres is supplied by the representations of comic scenes in vase-paintings from Magna Graecia, belonging mostly to the third century B.C., in which the proscenium are depicted sometimes with, and sometimes without, such steps; and in certain paintings the steps are given by themselves. Dr. Dörpfeld asks why all these paintings come from Magna Graecia only; and why, out of the thousands of vase-paintings from Greece proper, there is no representation of actors performing upon a stage. The simple answer is that of the thousands of vase-paintings from Greece proper which belong to this period, there is no certain instance of a representation of a dramatic performance in the theatre. He further points out that in none of the vase-paintings is there any sign of a chorus in front of the proscenium. But the purpose of the artists in these paintings is merely to give the proscenium and the actors: the space in front of the proscenium is not included in the designs. Considering the strong connexion in many points between the Greeks of South Italy and those of Greece proper, the fact that these paintings exhibit steps corresponding exactly to those ascribed by Pollux and Athenaeus to the theatres of Greece, is at any rate a strong presumption in favour of the authenticity of their information.

One of the strongest objections to the new theory is the aesthetic one. If actors and chorus had been on the same level, the chorus, standing in front of the actors, and between them and the audience, would have hidden them from view. In fact, supposing Dr. Dörpfeld's theory to be correct, the only natural arrangement for the chorus would have been one similar to that adopted on the modern stage, when crowds of soldiers or citizens are introduced. The chorus, at any rate during the dialogue, would have arranged themselves *behind* the actors, and would have come forward to perform their dances when the dialogue was over. To this objection Dr. Dörpfeld makes the following replies. (1) He says that the chorus did not conceal the actors from view, because it was 'usually' divided into half-choruses, which stood on each side of the orchestra. But in the first place, even if this had been the case, the chorus would still have obstructed the view of the persons sitting on each side of the auditorium. In the second place, there is no

evidence to show that the chorus was 'usually' divided into half-choruses. On the contrary, the evidence upon the subject proves that under ordinary circumstances the chorus was drawn up in a rectangular formation in front of the actors, with its back to the audience and its face towards the stage. (2) He points out that the chorus was small in comparison with the large size of the orchestra. But the dimensions of the orchestra would do little to remove the impropriety of placing a chorus of fifteen or twenty-four persons in front of the three actors, upon whom the principal attention of the audience was concentrated. (3) The actors, he says, would easily be discriminated from the chorus by their dress and by the use of the cothurnus. To this I would reply that, as far as comedy is concerned, the cothurnus was not used at all, and the dress of the actors was not nearly so conspicuous as in tragedy. Yet a means of discrimination between actors and chorus would be more essential in comedy than in tragedy, seeing that the comic chorus was nearly twice as large as the tragic. It is true that in tragedy the dresses of the actors were most magnificent, and the use of onkos and cothurnus would cause the actors to appear about a head taller than the chorus. But the only effect of this arrangement would be that the spectators would never altogether lose sight of the actors, but would have a continuous view of their heads, and catch frequent glimpses of their bodies between the bodies of the choreutae. No amount of magnificence in the dress of the actors would compensate for the fact that a chorus of fifteen persons was stationed permanently between them and the audience. (5) Dr. Dörpfeld points out that as the auditorium rose in gradually ascending tiers, the higher a person sat, the more he would see of the actors. But surely it is a peculiar theory which compels its author to admit that the ordinary citizens, who paid their two obols for a seat at the back, had really a better view than the great dignitaries sitting in the front rows.

There is one criticism of mine (*Attic Theatre*, p. 145) to which Dr. Dörpfeld makes no reply. On looking at the ground-plan of the theatre at Epidaurus it will be found that within the orchestra there is a large circular dancing-place, marked off by a stone border, and approaching to within two or three feet of the front of the proscenium. The same arrangement was probably to be found in other theatres of the period. The purpose of the circle was obviously to enclose

the performers in a symmetrical manner. Now it is evident that, if the actors stood in the orchestra, and in front of the proscenium, a circle whose circumference reached to within two or three feet of the proscenium would be an altogether inappropriate figure for the purpose intended. The actors would have to stand on the very edge of the circle. To bring them well within the circle would be to remove them too far from the palace or temple or other background, before which the action was supposed to be taking place. But if they stood within reasonable proximity to the background, they would be standing almost on the border of the circle. The arrangement would be most unsymmetrical and displeasing to the eye. Supposing Dr. Dörpfeld's theory to be correct, we should have three actors, with occasional attendants, standing in front of the proscenium, and a chorus facing them from the orchestra. Such being the case, the only natural figure to mark out upon the ground for the purpose of enclosing the performers would be a figure of the nature of a semicircle, with its base formed by the proscenium itself. It appears therefore that the arrangement of the orchestra in the theatre at Epidaurus is in itself a strong confirmation of the ordinary view about the position of the actors and the chorus.

There are certain passages in Aristophanes which bear upon the present subject; but I have only space to refer to them very briefly. (1) The words *εἰσβαίνειν* and *καταβαίνειν* are used by Aristophanes in much the same sense as 'enter' and 'exit' on the English stage, plainly showing that the actors appeared upon a platform. Dr. Dörpfeld contends that this meaning arose in the sixth century, when the actor used to mount on the thymelê to deliver his speeches. It is true that in this way the words might have acquired the meaning 'to begin a speech,' or 'to end a speech'; but they could hardly have come to denote 'enter' and 'exit' in the modern theatrical sense, unless the actors had appeared on a platform throughout their performance. (2) Philocleon, in the *Wasps* (1514), when he sees the sons of Carcinus in the orchestra, exclaims, 'I must go down to them,' (*ἀτὰρ καταβατέον γ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*). Dr. Dörpfeld prefers to translate 'I must contend with them'; and this, as I myself pointed out, is a possible rendering. But I still think the other translation the more natural. The fact that a few lines previously Philocleon had been giving an exhibition of dancing (not 'leading the dance,' as Miss Harrison puts it) is no proof that

he was already in the orchestra. To assume that dancing on the stage was impossible is to assume one of the points at issue. (3) In the *Birds* (175-178), when the Epops is told to 'look down, look up, and look round about him,' and is then asked what he sees, he replies that he sees nothing but 'the clouds and the sky.' Dr. Dörpfeld explains the request to 'look down' by saying that the scenery on the proscenium depicted a cavern with an *ascending* pathway. But how could a scene with a cave and sloping pathway be affixed to the long and low proscenium in such a manner as to give an actor in the orchestra the appearance of standing on an eminence; so that it would be natural for him, when asked to look down, to reply that he saw nothing but the clouds and the sky?

There is also the passage in Plato's *Symposium* (p. 194), where Agathon is said to have 'mounted the stage along with his actors, and gazed in the face of the audience.' Dr. Dörpfeld is mistaken in supposing that I imagined the reference to be to a performance in the theatre. I expressly stated (*Attic Theatre*, p. 145) that the reference was to the Proagon, which was held in the Odeion. Whether the Odeion here meant was the 'theatre-shaped' Odeion near the Eneakrounos, or the circular Odeion of Pericles, is a question of too great intricacy to be discussed in the present place. Nor does it affect the argument. The salient fact remains that the poet and his actors took their stand upon an elevated platform at the Proagon. The Proagon was a preliminary spectacle, in which poet, actors, and chorus exhibited themselves to the people. If in ordinary dramatic performances actors and chorus had stood on one and the same level, it would have been only natural to adopt a similar arrangement at the Proagon. The fact therefore that at the Proagon the actors stood on a raised platform tends to show that a difference in level between actors and chorus was considered to be the proper arrangement. Of course the ceremonies at the Proagon do not *prove* anything one way or the other concerning the performances in the theatre. But as far as the evidence goes, it is distinctly in favour of the ordinary theory regarding the position of actors and chorus.

To sum up the general results. I think I have shown that the recent architectural and archaeological discoveries, so far from confirming the new theory, tend strongly in the opposite direction. The dimensions of the proscenium are proved to have been exactly

such as Vitruvius describes; and the existence of a circular dancing-place immediately in front of the proscenium points evidently to the conclusion that the proscenium did not serve as a background to the actors. Then we have the unanimous opinion of the ancient grammarians and lexicographers, who had access to contemporary evidence. Further, there is the inherent improbability of an arrangement which places the chorus *between* the actors and the audience. On the other side there are merely certain *a priori* considerations as to what the size of the Greek stage *ought* to have been. Such considerations, based on modern associations and ideas, should be received with the greatest caution, in discussing archaeological problems which refer to a period two thousand years ago. I have shown that the narrowness of the Greek stage was entirely in harmony with the scenic character of the Greek drama. On the whole I fail to see, in the facts and arguments which have recently been brought forward, any sufficient reason for departing from the old opinion, that the actors performed upon a stage, the chorus in the orchestra.

A. E. HAIGH.

ACQUISITIONS OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. A cameo of elliptical form .04 in. long by .025 wide, found at Cyzicus. The design represents a right hand holding a right ear between the first finger and thumb: above this is festooned an object which may be a purse or a string of beads. Around the margin runs an inscription ΜΗΜΟΝΕΥΕ-ΜΟΥΤΗΣΦΙΛΙΑΣΟΠΟΥΠΟΤΕ.....

Μνημόνευέ μου τῆς φίλλας ὄπου ποτέ... The lower right hand portion of the cameo is broken away, including the wrist and part of the hand, and about a quarter of the inscription. Mr. Murray suggests as a restoration the words [γῆς πορεύεις]. The Museum already possesses three gems of this class (Cat. Nos. 2148-2150) but these have merely the single word μνημόνευε.

2. (i). A sard scaraboid of beautiful Greek work; a Seilenos moving to the l. in a stooping position, carrying on his back an askos: in his r. he holds the spout of the askos, in his l. a cord which passes around it.

(ii). A lenticular gem in haematite: two figures seizing a bull by the horns. The one figure stands in front of the bull, the other is represented lengthwise in the space over the bull's back. This gem seems to confirm the opinion expressed by Heydemann (*Arch. Anzeiger*, 1889, p. 190), as to the figure over the bull in the celebrated Tiryns wall painting: the position of this figure is not that of an acrobat, but is merely due to an archaic defect of perspective; the style of the gem seems to mark it as of that period.

(iii). A circular gem in steatite, engraved on both sides in a rough archaic style. *Obv.* a running figure (of the 'kneeling' type) holding some object above his head in either hand: in the field a bough. *Rev.* a Pegasus springing away to the right; between his feet a bough. Acquired in Athens.

(iv). A similar gem in steatite: on the surface is traced in line a primitive representation of a Gorgon mask, with tusks and protruding tongue.

(v). A similar gem in steatite: intaglio of a water-bird with an eel or snake in its beak: above it, a dolphin. From Galaxidi.

(vi). Eight bronze fibulae of various forms, found near Rome. On the arch are different ornaments consisting of rings of bronze loose or fastened, beads of glass and amber, and engraved patterns.

3. (i). Limestone mould for casting coins: there are six separate types with a channel running into each. The types are of late date, and are grouped in pairs: two are representations of Tyche, two of Athens with helmet, spear, and shield resting on ground, and two of Nike holding up a wreath, with a palm-branch. From Rome.

(ii). A terracotta model (.035 m. high, solid) of a kantharos, wanting one handle and the foot. Across the orifice is incised ΘΕΤΗΞ. From Smyrna.

(iii). A rosette, and a minute figure, in terra-cotta gilt.

(iv). A bronze spike.

4. A two-handled cup of glazed ware which is green on the outside and yellow within; around it are moulded patterns of ivy. From the Greek islands.

5. A series of fragments of pottery, painted stucco, and of a vitreous substance (κίανος?) from

the floor of a room, from Tiryns: and a fragment of Mykenae ware from the Akropolis at Athens.

6. Ten wreaths of various flowers and shrubs (rose, myrtle, henna, immortelle—the helichrysos of the ancients), from Graeco-Egyptian tombs at Hawara in the Fayoum. See Petrie's *Hawara, Biahmu and Arsinoe*, pp. 46-53.

Cecil Smith.

AN INSCRIPTION FROM PAPHOS.—Among the inscriptions found at Paphos and published in the *Hellenic Journal*, vol. ix. p. 225 ff., No. 14 occupies a prominent position. The stone is now in the British Museum, and the document will, no doubt, eventually take its place in the publication of the inscriptions which is now proceeding. In the meantime I would offer the following essay towards its final restoration.

Mr. Cecil Smith has kindly sent me an excellent impression: there is little to alter in the text. In line 6 the first letter is Θ , not Ω : at the beginning of line 15 I only see the upper horizontal stroke (part of Γ or Σ not Θ): line 18 should be $\Sigma\Theta\Theta\epsilon\Gamma\epsilon\Gamma\Gamma\Theta$ — $\Gamma\Theta$ — $\Pi\Gamma\text{IAI}\Theta\text{YK}\Theta$: after ΩMAI , in line 23 is a vacant space. We have here two letters of King Antiochus (probably Antiochus IX.): the first and longest (ll. 1—18) is addressed to King Ptolemy Alexander, the second (ll. 19 ff.) to the Seleucians.

Letter I.

- Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος βασιλεὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ καὶ
 Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσαι εἴη ἂν ὡς βου-
 λόμηνθα, καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ὕγιαίνουσιν καὶ σοὺ ἐμνημονεύουσιν
 5 φιλοσ[το]ργῶν. Σελευκεῖς τοὺς ἐν Πιερίᾳ τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου,
 ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν προσκληρωθέντας καὶ τὴν
 πρὸς αὐτῶν εὐνοίαν μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν συντηρήσαν-
 τας ἐπιταβ[έ]ντας δὲ τῇ πρὸς ἡμᾶς φιλοστοργίᾳ καὶ ταύ-
 10 τῃ διὰ μεγάλων καὶ καλῶν ἔργων καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς ἐπει-
 γουσίᾳ ἀναγκα[ί]οις τοῖς καιροῖς ἀποδεικνύμενοι καὶ κα-
 ταφανῶς καὶ μεγαλοψύχως καὶ αὐτῶν ἀξίως, ἐπαυξήσαντες
 μὲν εἰς τὸ ὑπάρχον προσηγάμενοι ἀξίωμα, καὶ νυνὶ δὲ, τῆς πρώ-
 15 τῆς καὶ μεγίστης εὐεργεσίας καταξιώσαι σπουδάζοντες
 αὐτοὺς, κατεστήσαμεν εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐλευθέρους,
 παρενεγράψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς αἰς ἐποισάμεθα πρὸς ἀλλή-
 λους συνθήκαις δόξαντες οὕτως καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα
 αὐτῶν πεφιλανθρωπημένον] ἐκφανέστερον ἴσασθαι.
 δοκεῖ δὲ, ἵνα τὰ πάντα παρακολουθῆς, καλῶς ἔχειν
 εἰδέναι σε ἔρρωσθε. Ἐ(τους) γς. Γορπιαίου κθ.

Whatever the exact sense of προσκληρωθέντας in line 5 may be, the reference seems to be to the expedition of Antiochus Sidetes to Syria, after the defeat and capture of his brother by the Parthians. Seleucia was the first town which opened its gate to him.

In line 15 a supplement containing two letters less

is required. As King Antiochus' reasons for sending to Ptolemy the copy of his letter to the Seleucians which follows are by no means obvious, I think that lines 17—18 must contain a statement of them, but I cannot find room for any satisfactory restoration in this sense. For this use of παρακολουθεῖν see Liddell and Scott.

Letter II.

- Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Σελευκέων τῶν ἐν Πιερίᾳ τῆς ἱε-
 20 ρᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου τοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ
 χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσθε ὅμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις εἴη ἂν ὡς βουλόμην-
 θα· ἐπέψαμεν ὑμῖν ἀντίγραφον τῆς στηλῆς ἧς γέ-
 γραπται συμφέτοχος ἡ πόλις ὑμῶν· αὐτὸς ἔρρωμαι.
 Δεῖ οὖν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς ὅπως ἅπαντα γίνηται ἀκολου-
 θῶς τοῖς συντεταγμένοις.]

A word as to the date. The month Gorpiaeus of the year 203 of the Seleucid aera falls in the year 108 B.C. This was already known to be the date of the autonomy of Seleucia (Eckhel *D. N.* III. p. 327). The Seleucians henceforth began to date their coins

from this year. The dates on the coins range from 4 to 26. This takes us to B.C. 83—82. Seleucia then retained its autonomy during the reigns of the last Seleucid kings, and lost it when taken by king Tigranes.

The two fragments (Nos. 3 and 4 *ibid.*), found on successive days and therefore, I suppose, near each other, certainly seem to be parts of the same inscription, the two last lines fitting exactly, but the editors possibly had good reasons for dissociating them.

W. R. PATON.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT: s. v. *ῥελάθος*:—*τὸ ῥε. a temple (at Bálbek) with huge columns consisting of three stones each, 10. Malak.*

The allusion by John Malalas occurs at p. 344 of the Bonn edition; and there is a similar allusion in the Paschal Chronicle, vol. i. p. 561, same edition. To elucidate this, Dindorf reprints Markland's dissertation, where the above explanation of the term was first suggested: see vol. ii. p. 398. Markland, however, bases his explanation entirely on a statement by Maundrell, *Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, p. 136, edition of 1721: and his perversity is truly astonishing. Maundrell observes incidentally that the columns consist of three stones each, without laying any stress upon this detail: but on the next page he thinks it necessary to vindicate his own veracity before giving the measurements of the three celebrated stones in the outer wall.

CECIL TORR.

ARISTOTLE, *Economics*, ii. 2, 23.—Timotheos was commanding an Athenian force at Coreyra, and was extremely short of money; but when his men began to clamour for their pay, he pacified them all by giving them (according to the present reading) their allowance for rations for three months in advance, *τὴν προδεδομένην τριμήνου σιταρχίαν*. Xenophon, *Hellenica*, v. 4, 63, says that Timotheos took sixty triremes with him to Coreyra in 375 B. C. Demosthenes, in *Timotheum*, 11, says that he obtained a sum of seven minae from each of the sixty trierarchs to supply the crews with rations. Isocrates, *de perniatone*, 109, says that he took with him fifty triremes (clearly, sixty) and only thirteen talents in money. Thirteen talents, divided among sixty triremes, gives thirteen minae for each; and the seven minae from each of the sixty trierarchs increases this to twenty minae for each trireme. In estimating the cost of a fleet, Demosthenes, in *Philippum*, i. 28, puts the allowance for rations for each trireme at twenty minae monthly, *τοῦ μηνός*. I would therefore venture to read *τοῦ μηνός* for *τριμήνου* in the phrase quoted above. According to the author of the *Economics*, ii. 2, 29, the allowance for rations was properly payable in advance at the beginning of each month.

CECIL TORR.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. 1888, vol. ix. no. 2.

1. Harrison: publishes the Orpheus fragments by (probably) Euphronios: plate. 2. Excavations in Cyprus 1887—8 (i) Hogarth: the first season's work, preliminary narrative: (ii) James: on the history and antiquities of Paphos: (iii) Elsey Smith: the temple of Aphrodite: its architectural history and remains: (iv) E. A. Gardner: the temple: results of the architectural evidence. (v) The same: contents of the temple. (vi) Gardner, Hogarth, James: inscriptions of Kuklia and Amargetti: (vii) Hogarth and James: tombs: five plates, several cuts. 3. Ely: discusses the rendering of the Theseus-Skiron legend in art and literature and gives a cut of a new instance on a kylix at Vienna. 4. Middleton: the temple of Apollo at Delphi: gives (i) evidence gleaned from ancient sources: (ii) a suggested restoration, based on this and on actual measurements: plan, fourteen cuts. 5. Hicks: a sacrificial calendar from Cos: two

fragments were given in the *Bulletin* vol. v. p. 216: two more are here published, found by Mr. Paton. 6. The same: four new inscriptions from Iasos. 7. Hogarth: notes upon a visit to Celaenae-Apamea: discusses the question of the spring connected with the Marsyas legend. 8. Ramsay: a study of Phrygian art, part i: 'a statement of the historical views to which he has been led by a study of the Phrygian monuments': description of two series of Phrygian monuments: thirteen cuts.

Notices of books. Petrie's Tanis vol. II.: Mayer's Giganten: Winnefeld's Hypnos: Arndt's Vasenkunde: Abbott's History of Greece: Baedeker's Griechenland: and the Guide Joanne, Grèce I. C. S.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. Part iii. 1889. Berlin.

1. Schleuning: Velia in Lucania, colonised by the Phokians in the second half of the sixth century B. C.: a detailed description of the site and the visible remains: two plans, twenty-five cuts. 2. Schneider: publishes the Andokides cup (*Meistersignaturen* p. 191, No. 6) which has mixed designs of both black and red figures on the exterior: discourses on (i) the amphora of double technique; (ii) the artistic position of Andokides; and (iii) his historical position: plate. 3. Boehm: Aphrodite riding on a goat: publishes a r. f. vase with this scene, and collects other instances of the same type. Identifies type with Attic *πάνθημος*. This vase is the earliest representation of it known in painting: two cuts. 4. Schumacher: publishes a series of archaic vases from La Tolla, recently acquired by the Karlsruhe Museum: one is a Korinthian-Attic amphora, with an interesting representation of the freeing of Prometheus: double plate. 5. The same: publishes a drawing, found among some private papers, of a third fragment of the underworld vase-picture in Karlsruhe (Winnefeld p. 62): plate. 5. Hülsen: the Regia: (i) earlier excavations between the temples of Castor and Faustina, (ii) excavations in the Regia 1888-9: (iii) the Regia of Domitianus Calvinus: two plans and ten cuts in text.

Anzeiger: Obituary, de Witte. It is arranged to give here in future a report of the acquisitions and growth of all the German collections, as well as that of Berlin, together with small cuts to serve as notes. Such a report is here commenced of Berlin, Munich and Dresden. Acquisitions of British and Boston Museums. Note on the Rogers collection. Notes of new casts purchasable in Louvre, London, &c. P. W. writes on certain forgeries of inscribed fragments of pottery, now on sale at Athens. Meetings of the Institute. News. Notes on *Jahrb.* iv. p. 109 (Weizsäcker) and *ibid.* p. 119 (Wolters): on *Anzeiger* 1889 p. 45 (Furtwängler). Bibliography. C. S.

The same. Part iv. 1889. Berlin.

1. Hauser: republishes certain marble fragments in the Museum at Palermo which formerly (Serradifalco, *Antich. di Sicilia* v. pl. 39 &c.) were thought to belong to a candelabrum: they are parts of a throne with reliefs, of the Neo-Attic school, and throw light on the Zeus throne at Olympia: five cuts. 2. Heydemann: (i) publishes a late vase painting (Jatta no. 412) to show that this and *B. M. Cat.* 810 are not Hektor's departure but merely genre scenes: the Homeric subject is represented on two gems in Berlin (Tolken iv. 284 and 288): (ii) two late vase pictures conceived under the influence of Homer's account of the slaying of Lykaon by Achilles: (iii) the scene on a b. f. hydria with *Πάρις καλός* is the departure of Priam to beg Hektor's body: plate. 3. Treu: the

Eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia : considers the various new views and criticisms proposed since his original arrangement (*Arch. Zeit.* 1882, pl. 15) : finds reason for alteration only in one particular, viz. the relative positions of the two female figures : plate, plan of the positions of the fragments as found, and twenty cuts.

Anzeiger : Newton testimonial. Meeting of philologists at Götting. Meetings of the Institute at Berlin. Report of Acquisitions : Dresden, Stuttgart, Hanover, Cassel, and a series of minor collections in

West Germany. Note on the von Wagner Institute of Würzburg University, by L. Ullrichs : on a collection in the Museum at Boulogne sur Mer, by M. Mayer. News. Notes on the second *Ergänzungsheft* of the *Jahrb.* p. 27 (Fabricius) : on *Jahrb.* iv. p. 113 (Hauser) : on *ibid.* p. 119 (Heydemann explains the 'acrobat' of the Tiryns wall-painting by reference to a Mykenaeen gem : the position of the man over the bull's back is merely an archaic fault of drawing). Bibliography.

C. S.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Hermathena. No. xvi. 1890.

J. P. Mahaffy writes on *The Slave Wars against Rome*. Among other points he explains that the number of slaves engaged in the first war was far larger than in the later insurrections owing to the latifundia in Sicily being agricultural, while those in Italy were pastoral. And why were the slaves Cilicians and Syrians? The slaves came from Carthage after its fall (146), and Carthage bought its slaves thence, conveying them direct from Tyre and Sidon to Carthage, not competing with Rome in the great Greek slave markets.—Robinson Ellis reviews very favourably Owen's *Ovid's Tristia*; and in the following passages proposes conjectures of his own :—II. 79 'carmina ne nostris te devenerantia libris' for Owen's 'quae te venerantia'; II. 157 'per patriam quae te et tuta et secura parente' for O.'s 'quae te tuta'; II. 449 'fallere custodem damnum docuisse fatetur' for O.'s 'custodes totiens'; II. 479 'ut parve sequisciat' for O.'s 'et comitare sequens sciat'; III. 1, 63 'quaeque uiri docto veteres peperere nouique' for 'cepere'; III. 5, 47 'non aliquid dixiue, elataue lingua loquendo est' for 'non aliquid dixi velataue lingua, etc. (Owen 'uesanague')'; III. 6, 16 'claudent' for 'claudens'; IV. 1, 62 'retusa' for 'secuta'; III. 10, 11 'petit' for 'patet'; V. 8, 20 'macra' or 'mota' for 'nostra'; V. 13, 6 'sic me non modico' for O.'s 'scilicet immodico.' Many other passages are handled.—A. Palmer also proposes the following conjectures in the *Tristia*: II. 125 'in electu' for 'in eventu'; II. 358 'Carmina mulcendis auribus apta fere' for 'plurima...feres'; II. 381 'haec quoque materiam saepe ruboris habet' for 'semper amoris'; II. 553 'catervis' for 'coturnis'; III. 3, 21 'si iam deficiam suppressaque lingua lababit' for O.'s 'si iam deficiat sub crasso lingua palato'; III. 6, 15 'sed mea me in poenam nimirum Parca trahebat; o mala ne claudant utilitatis iter' for 'fata trahebant'; III. 6, 30 'pavor' for 'pudor'; 31 'alio' for 'adeo'; IV. 5, 31 'uiuens' for 'iuuenis'; V. 7, 53 'fonte' for 'forte'; V. 10, 41 'in me aliquid linqui' for O.'s 'in se aliquid statui'; V. 13, 6 'saeva quod' for O.'s 'scilicet'.—R. Y. Tyrrell is severe upon *Verrall's Agamemnon*. 'One feels that he deliberately casts away the burden of his learning when his Ariel-fancy tempts him to flit after some empty creation of his own,' and 'the only principle I can detect in the edition is a determination to recoil as much as possible from received opinion, whether that received opinion maintains or impugns the evidence of the MSS.' 'Dr. Verrall should apply his conspicuous literary ability to the writing of a history of Greek literature.' The same reviewer highly praises *Tucker's Supplices*.—W. J. M. Starkie reviews *Rob. Ellis's Catullus*, and regrets the non-acceptance of not a few of Palmer's conjectures.

The reviewer adduces Apuleius 2, 38 'sic in modum superbi iuuenis Adonei domo proturbor' to 29, 8 'ut albulus columbus aut Adoneus,' takes 'nox' in 63, 21 to the archaic='noctu,' in 63, 54 proposes 'ad invia' for 'omnia,' and in 104, 1 suggests 'Vetti' for 'vitae.'—L. C. Purser says of *Haigh's Attic Theatre* that it is 'one of the finest specimens of exposition we have ever met,' and adds some remarks on details.—J. B. Bury supports by a new hypothesis the theory that Pindar's third Isthmian is really two hymns joined together.—A. Palmer would read in Aesch. *Pers.* 280 *παγκτοῖς δειπνα δάκσσαν* for *ἐν διπλάκσσαν*; in *Agam.* 562 *τί δ' οὐ| τείνοντες οὐ χαλῶντες ἡματος μέπος*; for *στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες*; in Arist. *Ecol.* 177 *σαπίνα* for *ἀπαντα*; in Catull. 64, 108 'indomitus subito contorquens flamine turbo' for 'turbo contorquens flamine robur.'—Other articles are : J. Quarry, notes, chiefly critical, on the Clementine Homilies and the Epistles prefixed to them; J. Gwynn, the older Syriac Version of the four minor catholic epistles; T. K. Abbott, the new edition of the Vulgate; T. K. Abbott, Margoliouth on Ecclesiastics.

The American Journal of Philology.

No. 39, Oct. 1889. A. Emerson, *On the conception of low comedy in Aristophanes*. An attempt to collect Aristophanes' opinions from the plays and fragments. Passages are classified as follows : (1) Plain statements of what is right and wrong in drama and comedy; (2) Self-glorifications to the audience; (3) Censure of predecessors and rivals; (4) His view of comedy—not as 'art for art's sake,' but as an instrument for inculcating sound principles, political and moral. 'Not a word of censure for the writings of rivals and not a self glorification in the whole of Aristophanes but contributes to make more and more distinct, the line that divides the low comedy, that of his predecessors and rivals on the comic stage, from the grand, which is his own.'—J. H. Moulton, *Notes in verbal morphology*. These include : (1) Some types of dissyllabic roots; (2) The *-nā*-class of unthematic verbs; (3) The suffix of the subjunctive; (4) The formation of the sigmatic aorist; and (5) The reduplication vowel *i*.—Windelband's *Geschichte der alten Philosophie* is reviewed by Prof. Shorey. 'A well-composed lucidly-arranged repetitorium of the external facts of Greek philosophy, which will doubtless be very serviceable to young German candidates who have no time to read their Zeller.' For others it is a disappointing book, and especially so as regards Plato.—There are brief mentions of the following :—The 2nd edition of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* in the second volume of the *Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, *Der freie formelhafte Infinitiv der Limitation*

im Griechischen in Schanz' Beiträge by Dr. Grünwald, Prof. Crusius' interpretation of the proverb, *ὁδὲ τὰ πρὶα Σηραϊχόπου γινώσκεις* in one of the *Commentationes Ribbeckianae*, and Prof. J. E. B. Mayor's *Latin Heptateuch*.

No. 40, Dec. 1889. E. P. Morris, *On the sentence-question in Plautus and Terence*. First paper, introductory. An elaborate article, with lists and analyses of questions with *ne*. A. *Ne* appended to the verb. B. *Ne* appended to pronouns. C. Nouns with *ne* appended. D. Adjectives and participles with *ne*. E. Adverbs with *ne*. F. *Itane*. G. *Satine*. H. *Potin*. —G. B. Hussey, *On the use of certain verbs of saying in Plato*. The dialogues are arranged in an order conditioned by the use of various verbs of saying, with a view to show that 'the stylistic method of finding the order of the dialogues has an unquestioned value.'—R. Seymour Conway, *The Duenos inscription*. An attempt to show that here 'we have before us a literal translation of a Greek formula preserved intact in a dozen curse inscriptions from the temple of Demeter at Cnidos.'—Paul Shorey, *συλλογισμοὶ ἐξ ὁμοθεύου in Aristotle*. τὸ μεταλαβόμενον does not mean (see L. and S. s.v. *μεταλαμβάνω*) a changed proposition, but a term (or possibly a proposition) taken in place of another in an argument by consent of the disputants—ἐξ ὁμοθεύου.—C. D. Buck, *On the forms Ἀρεμῆς, Ἀραμῆς*. From an examination of the occurrence of the word in various dialects it is probable that *Ἀρεμῆς* is the original form, and etymology should take this form as the basis.—R. C. Seaton contributes notes on Ap. Rh. III. 744 *foli*, and on *βληχρός, ἀβληχρός*. There is no trace of *βληχρός*=*ισχυρός*.—Prof. Gildersleeve has an interesting review of Ritter's *Untersuchungen über Plato*, in which the statistical method of determining the order of composition is rigidly applied.—B. P. notices *Ueber den zweiten Teil der Odyssee* by C. Reichert, which is a dissertation to prove that Kirchhoff's 'Fortsetzer' and 'Bearbeiter' were one and the same (see *A. J. P.* viii. 415).—There are brief mentions of Prof. Towle's *Protagoras* as compared with Sauppe's and of Prof. Flagg's *Iphigenia Taurica*, both in the White and Seymour series.

This number completes the tenth volume, and contains an excellent index to the *A. J. P.* from the beginning.

Göttingische gelehrte Anzeiger. 1889, No. 17—1890, No. 4.

No. 20, Oct. 1. J. Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie* (Maass). An attempt to present the genealogy of the distinguished Athenian families. Good in the main, though at times, considering the material at hand, not so satisfactory as could be wished.

No. 22, Nov. 1. R. Meister, *Die griechischen Dialekte auf Grundlage von Ahrens' Werk: de Graecae linguae dialectis*. Band II.: Eleisch, Arkadisch, Kyprisch. Verzeichnisse zum ersten und zweiten Bande (O. Hoffmann). Explanatory and historical remarks precede in each case the presentation of the dialectic peculiarities. Syntax as well as word-formation considered. The work is thorough, and presents a comprehensive view of the subject. The material is well arranged and well presented. The author's occasional ignorance however on points of detail renders caution necessary to the inexperienced student.

Nos. 24 and 25, Dec. 1 and 10. W. Soltau, *Römische Chronologie* (Matzat). A great part of the work is directed against Matzat's book on the same subject. The reasonings and conclusions are not convincing. The criticism deals with details.

No. 26, Dec. 20. M. Wiassak, *Die Litiskonstatation im Formularprozess*; H. Schott, *Das ius prohibendi und die formula prohibitoria*; A. Wach, *Der Feststellungsanspruch*. Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Rechtsanspruch (J. Merkel). 1. An attempt to fix the form of the *litis contestari* in the written proceedings of the Roman court. 2. A discussion of the meaning of the terms *ius prohibendi* and *formula prohibitoria*.

No. 3, Feb. 1, 1890. S. P. Lambros, A collation of the Athos Codex of the *Shepherd of Hermes*. Trans. and ed., with a preface and appendices by J. Armitage Robinson (Loofs). A collation of the 14th century MS. (6 pages) found in 1880 by Prof. Lambros, with the Simonides text (3 pages) at Leipzig. We are now in possession of nine-tenths of the *Shepherd* in one MSS.

No. 4, Feb. 15. P. Egenolf, *Die orthographische Stücke der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Blass). This does for the orthographic pieces of the Byzantine literature what Mannheim's programme does for the orthoepic pieces. Herodian and his sources considered. —*Teletos Reliquiae* edidit Prolegomena scripsit Otto Heuse (Hans v. Arnim). Here are considered questions relating to time of composition of the matter, personality and philosophic tendencies of the author, &c.—T. Bergk, *Griechische Litteraturgeschichte*. Vierter Band, aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von R. Peppmüller (O. Crusius). The last of Bergk's great work. It contains (1) some pages on comedy; (2) stray pieces on pre-Aristotelian prose; (3) an article introductory to the study of Alexandrian and Roman literature. It goes without saying that the work is not so satisfactory as it would have been had it received the final revision of the author.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Dix* (C. M.) A Second Latin Reader and Writer. Post 8vo. 106 pp. (Parallel Grammar Series). Sonnenschein. 1s. 6d.
Euripides. Alcestis, with introduction, notes, appendices, and a complete vocabulary by M. A. Bayfield. 12mo. 116 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
 Iphigenia in Tauris. A literal translation by G. F. H. Sykes and J. H. Haydon. 12mo. Clive. 2s. 6d.
Fox (H. F.) and *Bromley* (T. M.) Models and Exercises in Unseen Translation. Latin and Greek. 434 pp. Frowde. 5s. 6d.
Frazer (J. G.) The Golden Bough: a Study in Comparative Religion. 2 vols. 8vo. Macmillan. 28s.

- Herodotus*. Book V. Terpsichore, with introduction, notes, and map, ed. by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. xxxv, 225 pp. Cambridge University Press. 3s.
 Book VI, with introduction, notes, etc. by W. F. Mason and C. S. Fearenside. 12mo. 128 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.
Josephus. Whiston's translation, revised by Rev. A. R. Shilleto, with topographical notes by Sir C. W. Wilson. Vols. IV. and V. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d. (Bohn's Standard Library.) Bell & Sons.
Plutarch's Lives of Galba and Otho, with introduction and explanatory notes by E. G. Hardy. 12mo. 394 pp. Macmillan. 6s.

- Postgate* (J. P.) The First Latin Primer, being an adaptation of the New Latin Primer for the use of beginners. Post 8vo. 120 pp. Cassell. 1s.
- Prudentius*, translations from, a selection from his works, rendered in English verse, with an introduction and notes by Francis St. John Thackeray. 8vo. lxxiii, 231 pp. Bell & Sons. 7s. 6d.
- Rutherford* (W. G.) First Greek Syntax. 12mo. 180 pp. Macmillan. 2s.

- Sabrinæ Corollæ*. New edition. 8vo. 484 pp. Bell and Sons. 10s. 6d.
- Thompson* (F. E.) Homeric Grammar for Upper Forms of Schools. Cr. 8vo. 152 pp. Rivingtons. 2s. 6d.
- Vergil*. Aeneid. Book III. with notes and vocabulary. 12mo. 147 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Wharton* (Edward Ross). Etyma Latina: an etymological lexicon of Classical Latin. Cr. 8vo. xxxiv, 152 pp. Rivingtons. 7s. 6d.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aristophanes*. Die Wespen. In den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt von R. Lang. 8vo. v, 141 pp. Schaffhausen. 2 Mk.
- Ball* (H.) Die Bekanntschaft römischer Schriftsteller mit Herodot. (I.) 4to. 24 pp. Pr. Berlin.
- Baumack* (J.) Aus Epidaurios. Eine epigraphische Studie. (I.) 4to. 20 pp. Pr. Leipzig.
- Bernhard* (J. A.) Ueber Ciceros Rede von den Consularprovinzen. 4to. 28 pp. Pr. Dresden.
- Bieger* (J.) De Auli Persii Flacci codice Pithoeano C. recte aestimando. 8vo. 53 pp. Dias. Berlin.
- Bieler* (J.) Ueber die Echtheit des Lucianischen Dialogs de Parasito. 4to. 23 pp. Hildesheim. 1 Mk.
- Bock*. Probe einer Uebersetzung des Homer. 4to. 30 pp. Pr. Neu-Strelitz.
- Bonnet* (M.) Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours. 8vo. 787 pp. Hachette, Paris. 10 fr.
- Narratio de Miraculo a Michaele Archangelo Choriis patrato, adiecto Symeonis Metaphrastae de eadem re libello. 8vo. xlviii, 32 pp. Map. Paris, Hachette.
- Bordelle* (G.) Aufgaben zum Uebersetzen ins Griechische im Anschluss an Lysias. 8vo. 25 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 75 Pf.
- Brandt* (P.) Zur Entwicklung der Platonischen Lehre von den Seelenteilen. 4to. 35 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Bruchmann* (C. F. H.) Beiträge zur Ephoros-Kritik. I. 4to. 17 pp. Pr. Breslau.
- Büdingen* (M.) Katull und der Patriciat. Eine historische Untersuchung. 8vo. 40 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 70 Pfg.
- [Extract: Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften.]
- Cicero*. Paradoxa ad M. Brutum. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von H. Anz. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iii, 38 pp. Gotha, F. N. Perthes. 60 Pf. Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hefen. iii, 15, 22 pp. 60 Pf.
- M. T. oratio pro P. Sestio scholarum in usum editit A. Kornitzer. 12mo. v, 127 pp. Wien, Gerold's Sohn. Boards. 90 Pf.
- Somnium Scipionis. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von H. Anz. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iii, 22 pp. 30 Pf. Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hefen. 30 Pf.
- Collection de Reproductions de Manuscrits publiée par L. Clédât. Classiques latins, I. Catulle, manuscrit de Saint-Germain des Prés (Bibliothèque Nationale, No. 14, 137) précédé d'une étude de E. Chatelain. 8vo. vii, 77 pp. Paris, Leroux. 15 fr.
- Consbruch* (M.) De veterum περὶ νοσημάτων doctrina accedunt commentarii qui circumferuntur περὶ νοσημάτων Hephaestionei cum scholiis editi. 8vo. vii, 127 and xxxii pp. Breslau, Koebner. 5 Mk. 40.
- [Berliner philologische Abhandlungen. Band V. Heft 3.]
- Dürbach* (F.) L'Orateur Lycurgue, étude historique et littéraire. 8vo. 196 pp. Paris, Thorin.
- Ebeling* (H.) Schulwörterbuch zu Homer's Odyssee und Ilias. 5te verbesserte Auflage. 8vo. iv, 263 pp. Leipzig, Hahn's Verlag. 1 Mk. 80.

- Engelmann* (R.) Bilder-Atlas zu Ovid's Metamorphosen. 26 plates with Text. Folio. iii, 13 pp. Leipzig, Seemann. Boards. 2 Mk. 60.
- Ephemeris epigraphica*, corporis inscriptionum latinorum supplementum, edita jussu instituti archaeologici romani cura Mommsen, Ross et Hirschfeld. Vol. VII. Fasciculus 8. 8vo. pp. 273-428. Berlin, G. Reimer. 5 Mk.
- Fleiter* (G.) De minoribus quae sub nomine Quintiliani feruntur declamationibus. Commentatio philologica. 8vo. 34 pp. Münster. 1 Mk. 20.
- Frese* (F.) C. Valerius Catullus. Eine biographische Skizze mit neuen Uebersetzungsproben. 4to. 20 pp. Salzwedel. 1 Mk.
- Freund* (W.) Wanderungen auf klassischem Boden. Zur Einführung in die Kulturgeschichte der Griechen und Römer. Für Studierende, Schüler der Oberklassen und zum Selbststudium, Heft 2. 8vo. Breslau, Wohlfahrt. 1 Mk.
- [Contents: Die griechischen Ruhmesstätten: Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis, Plataeae. 73 pp.]
- Fulda* (C.) Der zweite Kommos der Elektra des Sophocles. 4to. 32 pp. Pr. Herford.
- Funk* (E.) De Thebanorum ab an. 378 usque ad an. 362 actis. 4to. 15 pp. Pr. Berlin.
- Gensicke*. Zweiter Sklavenkrieg auf Sicilien. Ein Beitrag zur Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit des beginnenden Verfalls. 4to. 19 pp. Pr. Bernburg.
- Gimazane* (J.) De Secundo Salustio Promoto, praetorio Galliarum et Orientis praefecto. 8vo. 88 pp. Thèse. Bordeaux.
- (J.) Ammien Marcellin, sa vie et son oeuvre. 8vo. 432 pp. Thèse. Bordeaux.
- Glaser* (R.) Klytämnestra in der griechischen Dichtung. 4to. 28 pp. Pr. Büdingen.
- Gutmann* (K.) Sogenanntes instrumentales ab bei Ovid. 4to. 38 pp. Pr. Dortmund.
- Handbuch der klassischen Alterthums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung herausgegeben von Iwan Müller. Halbband XIV. (Die griechischen Sakralaltertümer und das Bühnenwesen der Griechen und Römer, von P. Stengel und G. Oehmichen). 8vo. (Band V. Abteilung 3). 304 pp. 8 plates. München, Beck. 6 Mk. 50.
- Hankel* (F.) Die Ernennung und die soziale Stellung der römischen Kriegstribunen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des römischen Kriegswesens. 4to. 34 pp. Dresden. 1 Mk. 20.
- Hassebrank* (G.) Kaiser Septimius Severus. I. 4to. 25 pp. Pr. Holzminde.
- Heidhues* (B.) Das Gedicht des Simonides in Platons Protagoras. 4to. 14 pp. Pr. Köln.
- Heidingsfeld* (M.) Quomodo Plutarchus Thucydide usum sit in componenda Nicias vita. 4to. 32 pp. Pr. Liegnitz.
- Hertz* (M.) De Horatii operum exemplari olim Gnyetiano narratio I. 4to. 20 pp. Pr. Breslau.
- Hetzl* (J.) Beiträge zur Erklärung des Propertius. 8vo. 45 pp. Pr. Dillenburg.
- Hoff* (L.) Die Kenntniss Germaniens im Alterthum bis zum 2ten Jahrhundert nach Christ. 8vo. 86 pp. Coesfeld. 1 Mk. 50.
- Holzweissig* (F.) Lateinische Schulgrammatik in kurzer, übersichtlicher Fassung und mit besonderer

- Bezeichnung der Pensen für die einzelnen Klassen der Gymnasien. 3te Auflage. 8vo. viii, 224 pp. Hannover, Norddeutsche Verlagsanstalt. Bound. 2 Mk. 50.
- Holzweissig* (F.) Uebungsbuch für den Unterricht im Lateinischen. Kursus der Quinta. 2te verbesserte Auflage. 8vo. 173 pp. Hannover, Norddeutsche Verlagsanstalt. Bound. 1 Mk. 60.
- Horace*. Carmina. Oden und Epoden. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von K. K. Küster. 8vo. viii, 428 pp. Paderborn, Schöningh. 3 Mk.
- Oden und Epoden. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von K. K. Küster. 12mo. 116 pp. Paderborn, Schöningh. 80 Pf.
- Episteln. Deutsch von J. Kipper. 12mo. viii, 157 pp. Rostock, Volckmann und Jerosch. 1 Mk. 80.
- Thue* (W.) Römische Geschichte. Band VIII. Das Triumvirat bis zum Kaisertum. 8vo. v, 457 pp. Leipzig, Engelmann. 5 Mk.
- Irmacher* (E.) Vergils Aeneide, Buch V. in freien Stenzen übersetzt. 4to. 10 pp. Pr. Dresden.
- Kipper* (J.) Die Epistel an die Pisonen (über die Dichtkunst) des Quintus Horatius Flaccus in das Deutsche übersetzt. 4to. 14 pp. Pr. Rostock.
- Kirehner* (J. E.) Prosographiae Atticae specimen. 4to. 41 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 20.
- Knocke*. Der Gebrauch von plures bei Tacitus. 4to. 18 pp. Pr. Zerbst.
- Krebs* (F.) Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Gracität. Heft 3. 8vo. 30 pp. München, Lindauer. 1 Mk. 20.
- Lang* (R.) Die Wespen des Aristophanes. In den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt. 8vo. 141 pp. Pr. Schaffhausen.
- Langhans* (E.) Die Götter Griechenlands im Zusammenhang der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte. 8vo. 18 pp. Gel. Bern 89.
- Lohse* (E.) Tulliana. 4to. 18 pp. Pr. Berlin.
- Lübeck* (E.) Das Seewesen der Griechen und Römer. 4to. viii, 56 pp. Plate. Hamburg. 3 Mk.
- Meiners* (W.) Quaestiones ad scholia Aristophanea historica pertinentes. 8vo. 34 pp. Diss. Halle.
- Menge* (H.) Materialien zur Repetition der griechischen Syntax. 2 Teile in 1 Bände. 8vo. iv, 76 and 76 pp. Wolfenbüttel, Zwissler. 2 Mk.
- Meyer* (P.) Straboniana. 4to. 34 pp. Grimma. 1 Mk.
- Nagievski* (D.) In quaestiones Sapphicas observationes. 8vo. 16 pp. Casani. 1 Mk.
- Neckel*. Das Ekkyklema. 4to. 22 pp. Pr. Friedland.
- Nehring* (K.) Der lateinische Aufsatz. 4to. 17 pp. Pr. Berlin.
- Otto* (A.) Die geflügelten Worte bei den Römern. 4to. 14 pp. Pr. Breslau.
- Patzig* (E.) De Nonnianis in IV. orationes Gregorii Nazienzen commentariis. 4to. 30 pp. Leipzig, Hinrich's Sortiment. 1 Mk. 50.
- Planck* (H.) Das Lateinische in seinem Recht als wissenschaftliches Bildungsmittel. 8vo. vii, 104 pp. Wiesbaden, Kunze's Verlag. 1 Mk. 20.
- Plantii* (T. M.) Fabularum reliquiae Ambrosianae codicis rescripti Ambrosiani apographum confect et edidit G. Studemund. 4to. xxxii, 524 pp. Plate. Berlin, Weidmann. Boards. 70 Mk.
- Pomickau* (R. B.) De Isocratis Demonicea. 8vo. 52 pp. Diss. Leipzig 89.
- Pretsch* (B.) Zur Stilistik des Cornelius Nepos. 8vo. 47 pp. Pr. Spandau.
- Prohasel* (P.) Q. Curtii Rufi memoriae emendandae leges et proponuntur et adhibentur. 4to. 22 pp. Pr. Sagan.
- Ries*. J. de Aeneae Tactici commentario poliorcetico. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 44 pp. Halle. 1 Mk. 20.
- Robert* (C.) Die antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs. Im Auftrage des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten von F. Mutz herausgegeben und bearbeitet. Band II. Mythologische Cyklen. Folio. xii, 230 pp. Illustrations and 65 plates. Berlin, Grote. 225 Mk.
- Rosenthal* (M.) Quamnam curam Atheniensis post expeditionem illam a 415 in Siciliam factam rerum Siciliensium habuerint, quaeritur. 4to. 14 pp. Gross-Strehlitz, Wilpert. 1 Mk.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt Inschriften von Baunack, Bechtel, Bezzenberger etc. herausgegeben von H. Collitz. Band II. Heft. 2. 8vo. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 2 Mk. 60.
- Contents: Hofmann (O.), Die Orakelinschriften aus Dodona. Die Inschriften Achaia und seiner Colonien. 93-174 pp.
- Schädel* (L.) Das epische Thema der Odyssee und die Tiresias Weissagung. 4to. 25 pp. Offenbach a/M. 1 Mk.
- Schau* (R.) De formulis quas poetae graeci in conclusionibus orationis directae posuerint. Dissertatio inauguralis. 4to. 33 pp. Tilsae. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schmidt* (K.) Bemerkungen zu A. Scheindler's lateinischer Schulgrammatik. 8vo. 72 pp. Wien, Hölder. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schulze* (E.) Ueber Verschmelzung lateinischer Adjektiva mit nachfolgenden Substantiven zu einem Gesamtbegriffe. 4to. 16 pp. Homburg. 1 Mk.
- Schwarz* (I.) Kritik der Staatsformen des Aristoteles. Mit einem Anhang enthaltend die Anfänge einer politischen Literatur bei den Griechen. Vermehrte Ausgabe. 8vo. v, 138 pp. Eisenach, Barmeister. 3 Mk. 60.
- Siebert* (W.) Griechisches Lese- und Uebungsbuch für den Unterricht der Gymnasien und Progymnasien im Anschluss an die Schulgrammatik von Koch. 8vo. vii, 249 pp. Osterode. 1 Mk. 50.
- Sorntag* (M.) Bemerkungen zu Caesar de Bello Gallico. iv, 17. 4to. 9 pp. Frankfurt a/O. 60 Pf.
- Sophokles'* Antigone. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von J. Rappold. 2 Theile. 8vo. Wien, Hölder. 1 Mk. 40.
- [Contents: I. Einleitung und Text. vi, 76 pp. 80 Pf. II. Anmerkungen. 60 pp. 60 Pf.]
- Studien, Bonner. Aufsätze aus der Altertumswissenschaft. Reinhard Kekulé zur Erinnerung an seine Lehrthätigkeit in Bonn gewidmet von seinen Schülern. 8vo. iv, 260 pp. Plates. Berlin, Spemann. 20 Mk.
- Tacitus*. Dialogus de oratoribus. Erklärt von E. Wolff. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iv, 103 pp. Gotha, F. W. Perthes. 1 Mk. 20. Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Heften. iv, 34, 68 pp. 1 Mk. 20.
- Vergil's* Aeneide. Buch V., Metrisch übersetzt von E. Irmacher. 8vo. 31 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 60 Pf.
- Bucolica. Herausgegeben von F. Hermes. 12mo. 34 pp. Dessau, Kühle. 60 Pf.
- Voigt* (P.) De Luciani libellorum pristino ordine quaestiones. Particula I. 8vo. 40 pp. 5 plates. Cassel, Hülsm. 1 Mk. 50.
- Wernicke* (K.) Die griechischen Vasen mit Lieblingsnamen. Eine archäologische Studie. 8vo. vii, 143 pp. Berlin, G. Reimer. 4 Mk.
- Wormstall* (A.) De Corinthiacis tabellis fictilibus. 8vo. 42 pp. Münster. 1 Mk. 20.
- Zöckbauer* (F.) Betrachtungen zu Dr. A. Scheindler's lateinischer Schulgrammatik. 8vo. 39 pp. Wien, Konegen. 60 Pf.